

336. By Mr. MOREHEAD: Petition signed by 25 citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., requesting the repeal of the national-origins provision of the immigration act and the continuance of the quotas based on 2 per cent of the 1890 census, thereby supporting the President in his opinion on this question; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

337. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Manor Council, No. 112, Daughters of Liberty, opposing the repeal of the national-origins clause of the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

338. Also, petition of M. H. Birge & Sons Co., Buffalo, N. Y., with reference to wall paper tariff schedule No. 13; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

339. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of F. M. Fuller and Jed Wenpree, of Athens; T. C. Speed and L. K. Speed, Chandler; B. B. Almond, Malakoff; J. H. Allison, Eustace; and P. D. Nichols, Murchison, all in the State of Texas, in favor of a separate bill to increase tariff duties on competing farm products immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

340. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of the Medical Society of the county of Kings, Brooklyn, N. Y., renewing and reiterating its objection to the principles of the maternity act and favoring termination thereof on June 30, 1929; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, May 8, 1929

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 7, 1929)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

HUBERT D. STEPHENS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	La Follette	Smith
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Smoot
Barkley	Gillett	McMaster	Steak
Bingham	Glass	McNary	Steiwer
Black	Glenn	Metcalf	Stephens
Blaine	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Blease	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Greene	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Burton	Harrison	Patterson	Tyson
Capper	Hastings	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Edge	Kean	Sheppard	
Fess	Keyes	Shortridge	
Fletcher	King	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. COPELAND presented the following resolutions adopted by the Lockport (N. Y.) Men's Community Club, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCKPORT MEN'S COMMUNITY CLUB,

Lockport, N. Y., May 4, 1929.

Senator ROYAL COPELAND,  
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the last meeting of the Lockport Men's Community Club (Inc.), Lockport, N. Y.:

"Whereas Congress has passed and the President has signed the Norbeck bill providing for the expenditure of \$8,000,000 for the establishment of wild game and bird refuges; and

"Whereas Niagara County lies directly in one of what naturalists recognize as the four great natural paths for the migration of birds from north to south, owing to the narrow body of water which the birds can cross at this point, to wit, the Niagara River; and

"Whereas the Lockport Rod and Gun Club has already gone on record favoring the establishment of one of such refuges in Niagara County: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Lockport Men's Community Club (Inc.) is heartily in favor of the establishment of such a refuge in Niagara County and will do all in its power toward the accomplishment of this end; and

"Whereas Lockport, N. Y., was the lifetime residence of J. L. Davison, an internationally known and recognized authority on wild life and especially wild birds; be it further

"Resolved, That if it is or should be the policy of the Government to name these refuges, said refuge located in Niagara County should be named the J. L. Davison refuge; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be sent by the secretary to Senators WAGNER and COPELAND and Congressman DEMPSEY."

Yours very truly,

LOCKPORT MEN'S COMMUNITY CLUB,  
W. J. WHITESIDE, Secretary.

Mr. BLAINE presented a petition of the officers of the Anti-National Origins Clause League, Detroit, Mich., praying for the repeal of the national-origins provisions of the existing immigration law, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WALCOTT presented letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Connecticut Society, Daughters of 1812, and Quinipiac Council, No. 61, of the Sons and Daughters of Liberty, both at New Haven, and the National Society, Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the retention of the national-origins provision in the immigration law, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution of Enfield Grange, No. 151, Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, protesting against any change in the present oleomargarine laws, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Connecticut Department, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, favoring the passage of the so-called Robinson bill, granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans, their widows and dependents, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington Depot, New Haven, Portland, Waterbury, Branford, East Hampton, New Britain, East Lyme, Hartford, South Manchester, and Hamden, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the repeal of the national-origins provision of the existing immigration law, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HATFIELD presented a telegram signed by the Moorefield Orchards, A. L. Ewers & Son, Ewers Thompson Orchard Co., G. P. Miller Co., D. T. Williams, J. S. Zimmerman, Shull & Zimmerman Golden Orchard Co., of Romney, W. Va., favoring inclusion in the pending farm relief bill of a provision authorizing allotment of not less than \$50,000,000 as a revolving fund for the purpose of building common and cold storage plants in strategic producing centers to enable growers to store their fruit plants; when built should be sold by the Government to incorporated associations of not less than 10 growers within area affected on amortization plan based on payment in 20 years at cost and 4½ per cent interest, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram from the Consolidated Orchard Co., signed by H. W. Miller, president, Paw Paw, W. Va., favoring the inclusion of a provision in the pending farm relief bill for packing house and storage credit facilities for fruit growers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram from L. P. Miller, of Cumberland, Md., favoring inclusion in the pending farm relief bill of a provision for furnishing aid to apple growers in securing packing house and common storage facilities, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 101) to provide for producers and others the benefit of official tests to determine protein in wheat for use in merchandising the same to the best advantage, and for acquiring and disseminating information relative to protein in wheat, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 8) thereon.

### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1011) to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 1012) to amend section 12 of the act approved June 10, 1922, as amended, so as to authorize payment of mileage allowance to members of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

A bill (S. 1013) granting a pension to certain persons held as slaves on January 1, 1863; and

A bill (S. 1014) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### FARM RELIEF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing, and in the control and disposition of the surplus, of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I submit four amendments intended to be proposed by me to the pending farm relief bill. I ask that the amendments may lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is so ordered.

Mr. BLAINE. I desire to submit several amendments to the pending bill and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams relating to certain features of the farm relief bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORLANDO, FLA., May 7, 1929.

HON. PARK TRAMMELL,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Understand an amendment to Senate farm relief bill eliminating fresh fruits and vegetables has been introduced. We believe that if any relief is to be given to farm products fruit and vegetables should be included. Will appreciate your support in this.

INTERNATIONAL FRUIT CORPORATION.

WINTER HAVEN, FLA., May 8, 1929.

Senator PARK TRAMMELL,

United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States an act known as the Federal farm board act, and said bill, as introduced, has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate; and

Whereas said act, as passed by the House of Representatives, enables the State of Florida and the citrus industry to come under the full provisions of the act; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate an amendment to said act which, if adopted, would exclude fruit and vegetables from the benefits of the law, if passed; and

Whereas the principal industry in Florida, as well as California and many Southern and Southwestern States, is fruit and vegetables: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the advisory committee of fifty of the Florida Citrus Growers Clearing House Association voice their unalterable opposition to such an amendment and that we request Senators TRAMMELL and FLETCHER and the four Congressmen in the House of Representatives from Florida to vigorously oppose and prevent, if possible, the adoption of such amendment to the said Federal farm board act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to President Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Agriculture Arthur M. Hyde, United States Senators PARK TRAMMELL and DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, and Representatives HERBERT J. DRANE, R. A. GREEN, TOM A. YON, and RUTH BRYAN OWEN.

COMMITTEE OF FIFTY OF FLORIDA CITRUS

GROWERS CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in the fifth chapter of Nehemiah, and part of the third verse, the Scripture says:

Some also there were that said we have mortgaged our lands, vineyards, and houses.

And in the eleventh verse of the same chapter we find these words:

Restore, I pray you, to them their lands, their vineyards, their olive yards, and their houses.

Mr. President, the farming industry is the corner stone upon which all other industries rest. It is the mainstay and dependence of human beings everywhere. The welfare and continued existence of every nation on earth is dependent upon it.

In the face of these indisputable facts the business of the farmer in the United States has been regarded by many of those who dwell in the large cities of the East as an object of prey. They have resorted to unfair and unscrupulous methods to deprive the farmer of fair prices for his products. Yes; to rob him outright of the fruits of his toil. Year after year I, with a few other Members of this body, have pointed out the reprehensible and dangerous practices that have brought financial losses, serious injury, and even poverty to hundreds of thousands of American farmers and their families. You did not accept our suggestions, but now the farming situation throughout the country has become so serious, widespread, and desperate that the public generally is willing to have the Government do something to give the farmer a fair deal, to deliver him out of the hands of those who have prevented him from receiving profitable prices for the things that he has produced to feed and clothe the world. It is high time that Congress should come to the rescue of the agricultural army of America. It is a "condition" and not a "theory" that confronts us. And the question is, What are we going to do about it? The farmer is simply asking that the farming industry be put upon the same basis with other American industries. Can anybody say that is unfair or unreasonable?

Mr. President, no government has the right to permit the great producing industry of agriculture to become an object of prey for the greed of a band of conscienceless men. Turn back the pages of time for just 10 years and contrast the farmer's condition then with his condition to-day. There is all the difference in the world in the position and condition of the farmers of America now and in the year 1919. They were prosperous then. They obtained good prices for their products, and they were doing well. Practically every farmer in the country had money. They supplied themselves and families well with the things needed for their comfort and well-being. They spent that money freely. Business was good, and prosperity was seen on every hand. Then, without the semblance of justification and like a thief in the night a "deflation panic," terrible and destructive, came upon the country, and the value of farm products and farm lands were destroyed by the billions. It was then that I made the fight to finish those in the Government service who helped to bring about that deplorable and damnable panic. And the Senate sustained me in the fight I made. Labor was thrown out of employment, manufacturing industries were paralyzed for a time, merchants were bankrupt, and banks failed by the hundreds and thousands. You can not single out the all-important producing class, the farmers of America, and mistreat, rob, and oppress them without the evil effects of such a dangerous and reprehensible policy being felt throughout the body politic.

When the farmer is prosperous every other business in the community about him is prosperous. That is especially true in the agricultural sections of the country. When the farmer is prosperous, what the laboring man produces in the mine, workshop, and factory finds a ready buyer; what the merchant has to sell finds the farmer a good and a constant customer; and when the farmer is prosperous the family physician feels the benefit of the prosperity which the farmer enjoys; the lawyer, the preacher, and school-teacher, and all whose work or business is dependent upon the success of the farmer will tell you that when the farmer is prosperous their business is successful.

Now let us look at the other side of the picture. See the farmer when the price of his farm products are unprofitable, when his purchasing power and his debt-paying power are gone. See his empty wagon standing in the market place about to depart for home and hear a merchant say to him, "Are you not going to buy something to take home to your family?" And the farmer shakes his head and replies that he has nothing with which to buy; that the price received for his products will not enable him to pay for the goods already bought. He goes back home empty handed; and because of his unfortunate financial condition the merchant fails to sell him goods and his business is hurt. Those from whom he buys generally miss his trade and suffer because he has been deprived of his purchasing power. The debts that he has accumulated with the merchant through the year remain unpaid, and that merchant suffers, and the farmer goes into the next year in debt, dissatisfied and despondent. Then the doctor, the lawyer, the preacher, and the teacher all feel keenly in their respective stations the pinch of poverty that the farmer feels.

Senators, that man belongs to the class that produces food and clothing for human beings the world over. I have here a poem that I used four years ago when I discussed this question in the Senate. It was appropriate then; it is indeed appropriate now:



The politician talks and talks,  
The actor plays his part;  
The soldier glitters on parade,  
The goldsmith plys his art,  
The scientist pursues his germ  
O'er the terrestrial ball,  
The sailors navigates his ship,  
But the farmer feeds them all.

The preacher pounds the pulpit desk,  
The broker reads the tape;  
The tailor cuts and sews his cloth  
To fit the human shape.  
The dame of fashion, dressed in silk,  
Goes forth to dine, or call,  
Or drive, or dance, or promenade,  
But the farmer feeds them all.

The workman wields his shiny tools,  
The merchant shows his wares;  
The aeronaut above the clouds  
A dizzy journey dares.  
But art and science soon would fade,  
And commerce dead would fall,  
If the farmer ceased to reap and sow,  
For the farmer feeds them all.

Mr. Bryan, the great commoner, emphasizing the importance of the farming industry, once said:

Tear down your cities and leave your farms and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy your farms and grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

And that is literally true, Mr. President. When you prevent the farmer from receiving profitable prices for farm products, you make the farmer's business unprofitable, and in that way you destroy the farm as a means of successful livelihood.

Mr. President, there are short-sighted men here and there are now forces at work outside about this Capitol to defeat the efforts of certain Senators to bring about real farm relief at this extra session of Congress. Let us unite our forces, Democrats and Republicans, who believe in fair play and a square deal for the farmers and vote for a measure that will put the farming industry upon a sound business basis, one that will enable the farmer to sell his farm products at a price that will cover the cost of production and yield him a profit.

There is a large group in the East, and a powerful group it is financially, that is seeking to prevent the passage of a bill that will help the farmers out of the terrible difficulty in which they find themselves to-day. They think that by keeping the farmer poor, by making a peasant of him, yes, by making an agricultural slave of him, that it is best for them and their business, but that is not true. A prosperous farming class is good for them and good for every other class. Statistics show that farmers purchase more goods sold by manufacturer and merchant when they are prosperous than any other class of our citizens and that money flows into the channels of business everywhere. But, unfortunately, those to whom I refer do not want to see the farmer become prosperous. They want to keep him in the condition that I heard the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] describe once in a story about a certain horse. Farm products were selling below the cost of production; the owner, hard pressed for funds, had ceased to feed his horse as formerly, and the horse had lost in flesh until he was so thin and weak he wobbled when he walked. One day a neighbor said to Pat, his owner: "Why don't you put some flesh on that horse?" Pat replied: "By golly, he can hardly carry what he has got." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is the way a good many of these high-brow fellows in the big cities feel about the American farmer. They want him to stay in the condition that he is in to-day. When the price of his farm products is unprofitable and the farmer's business is unsuccessful they want to keep him toiling year in and year out producing for those who live in idleness, revel in their riches, and clip their coupons at leisure.

Senators, such an unfair and brutal system must be destroyed root and branch in America. The farmer must be put upon his feet; he must be delivered out of the hands of those who deprive him of fair prices and living profits. Congress must now do the thing necessary to enable the farmer not only to demand a profitable price for his products but to enforce his demand for such a price. No fair-minded person will deny that he is entitled to that. We have been sent here by the people to preserve this Government in its integrity; to be just and fair to every class; to do what is right as God gives us the light to see it. It is our duty to improve conditions wherever it is possible to do so, and in the name of 40,000,000 people in the agricultural sections of our country, and in the

name of common justice and fairness, I appeal to Senators from every section to cast their votes for a real farm relief measure at this session of Congress.

How is it with the farmers of America? What is their condition to-day compared to that of 10 years ago? That contrast presents a sad picture, Mr. President. The farmers were prosperous then. Then practically every farmer in the country had money in the bank, but that is not the case to-day. He is in debt, deeply in debt. A larger percentage of the farms of America are mortgaged to-day than ever before in the history of the country. And yet we have prosperity among a favored few, who tower above their fellows like peaks above a plain. The millionaires are prosperous, but the great rank and file of the people out yonder on the plain, where the masses dwell, do not share that prosperity; there is no prosperity there. They have but few of the comforts of life and not enough of life's necessities.

That situation has got to change. But some one says that the records show that a large number of mortgages have been settled and canceled. Yes, Mr. President; and about their settlement and cancellation there is a sad and mournful story. Those land mortgages by the tens of thousands have been foreclosed, and therefore the land covered by them does not appear upon the records as property mortgaged now as was formerly the case before the sheriff's hammer fell at the public sale. But what has become of the farmer's home and farm? Let us see what a line of distressing tragedy is taking place right here in the greatest government in all the world. That land is passing out of the hands of the farmer, into the hands of a favored few, who own their millions and hundreds of millions. What are they buying it up for, and buying it cheaply under mortgage sales? They are buying it for hunting preserves. Out yonder once there lived happy farm families; the glad prattle of little children was heard; father and mother were happy as their offspring, growing to manhood and womanhood about them, flourished in a congenial atmosphere at home, sweet home, on the farm. What is the situation now? Rank weeds grow in wild luxuriance around the old home place; the vacant home is fast going to decay; and the farm where once the happy plowman walked and worked, producing food and clothing for the world, is thick with bramble, weeds, and bushes. For what? For the purpose of making hunting preserves for the idle rich of the big cities of our country.

Senators, this is a sad but true picture, and it presents grave dangers for this Republic. This Government, a little more than a century and a half old, has reached the point already where the farmer is driven out of his occupation, loses the old homestead where for generations his fathers dwelt. The mortgage has been foreclosed, the hammer has fallen at public sale, and the farmer, his wife, and children, in despair, march off down the road without a cent in the world. They wend their way to the city, to live in crowded tenement houses, hunting and doing odd jobs about the town, leading a life entirely distasteful to them, leaving forever the occupation of the farm in which they were happy in a home they called their own and where they loved to live and work in God's open spaces. These are some of the dreadful fruits of the system that now afflicts and impoverishes the farmers of our country.

Mr. President, one of the things that must be done for the American farmer, whose business is so essential to the welfare of the Nation, is to enable him to obtain high-grade fertilizer at a reasonable price. If there ever was a people on earth who were imposed upon, held up and literally robbed every year by one great combination, it is the farmers of the United States, who are held up and robbed by the Fertilizer Trust of this Nation. Those who control that trust can meet and in one night—I have known them to do it—advance the price of fertilizer \$5 a ton, and the farmer, having no voice whatever in the matter, is compelled to pay it. This giant Fertilizer Trust in our midst is robbing American farmers annually of \$100,000,000. We have the means to prevent that if we were permitted to employ those means. We have in Alabama, at Muscle Shoals, a power dam with all of its units but one standing idle to-day that could produce a third of the fertilizer needed on the farms of the United States, but we are not allowed to turn a wheel for that purpose. The Power Trust on the one hand and the Fertilizer Trust on the other are both interfering, and this powerful combination seems to have a strangle hold upon the Government, and the farmers are denied their right to have cheap fertilizer. That is a fearful situation, Mr. President, and one that is sad to contemplate. These hard facts place the Government of the United States in the attitude of standing by with sealed lips and folded arms while this combination of fertilizer marauders rob the farmers of the South, East, North, and West of a hundred million dollars every year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHIPPS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. And in addition to what the Senator says, there is a specific provision in the statute which prohibits the President of the United States from turning Muscle Shoals over to a private company.

Mr. HEFLIN. Precisely; but, Mr. President, as the Senator knows, there is only one unit of all the units in that great power dam at Muscle Shoals in operation to-day. The others are idle and the water is going to waste. This tremendous power that can be turned to the advantage of the farmers of my State and of the South and of the whole country. As the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has said, by fertilizer experiment stations we could find out what it costs to produce a ton of fertilizer, and that would tell the farmer the truth as to the tremendous profits made on fertilizer sold to him by the Fertilizer Trust, but we are not even allowed to do that. The farmers of my State are paying \$25,000,000 a year for their fertilizer supply. We could easily cut their bill in half and save them twelve and a half million dollars by operating the Muscle Shoals project and reducing the price of fertilizer. And we are going to try to pass another bill at the regular session of Congress to do that.

Henry Ford's chief engineer, Mr. Mayo, testified at the hearings here before the Agricultural Committee that they had a process by which they could make fertilizer at Muscle Shoals that would cut the price of fertilizer in half. I helped to pass that bill in modified form through the Senate, but it never passed the House, and then Henry Ford got tired of waiting and withdrew his bid.

Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. BLACK] and I have fought here strenuously for legislation that would compel the manufacture of high-grade fertilizer at a much lower price at Muscle Shoals than it is being sold to-day. Together with other Senators we secured the passage last year of a measure that would have required the manufacture of such fertilizer at Muscle Shoals. But President Coolidge refused to approve it. No fertilizer for the farmer is being made at Muscle Shoals. The great power dam is still idle and the farmers of the South are still being robbed on their fertilizer bills. There is one thing certain, Mr. President, if the South and West will unite their forces now and hereafter they can compel fair treatment for these two great grain and cotton producing sections. You need not look for it from the East.

We find here that the powers that be respond readily to the call of favored interests. The tariff barons do not have any difficulty in getting a high tariff for the Aluminum Trust. They do not have any difficulty in putting some tariff rates sky-high, to a point that is really scandalous, on the big fellow's products. But the farmers, the great producing class, who live out yonder close to nature and to nature's God, are not getting a fair deal. Those in authority know that the farmers of America are to-day objects of prey for the Fertilizer Trust. The farm relief bill which is now before us will be of great benefit to farmers all over the country. And still we have lobbyists here—they are here to-day from the big cities of the East fighting the measure. They want to cut out of it everything that has teeth in it. They want a mere shell of a thing passed. They want a bill called farm relief passed, but they do not want us to put any real farm relief in it.

Mr. President, the farmers of America are getting their eyes open, and they are becoming impatient. They have not only been mistreated but fooled a lot of times, but you can not fool them many more times. Lincoln once said, "You can fool some of the people all the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can not fool all the people all the time." That is very true and very fortunate. I am heartily in favor of creating a Federal farm board, as this bill provides, and if that board will use its good offices, as I think it will, in supplying cash in the spring of the year to the farmers for the purpose of obtaining high-grade fertilizer at fair prices from their merchants it will be worth millions to our farmers, and it is entitled to our support for that purpose alone. There are other provisions in it with which I am in hearty agreement.

I am heartily in favor of the debenture plan. I advocated it in the Committee on Agriculture when we were preparing this bill. I supported it when I went to see the President as a member of a special committee sent by the Committee on Agriculture. I am for it because there is no doubt about it doing just what we want it to do.

There is real substance in that provision, Senators, that the farmer can get his hands upon.

These tariff-fattened highbrows who are enjoying high protection through the tariff do not want this debenture provision applied to the business of the farmer. They want it stricken out. I do not see why they should. It looks to me as if they would say, "We have always told you that this tariff proposition is a good thing and we are going to show you now that it is a good thing by applying it to you"; but instead of that they are saying, "It is good for us but not good for you." Well, sauce for the goose is going to be sauce for the gander in this measure. Why, Mr. President, we have even heard it suggested here that if you gave the farmer a good price for his products and made him prosperous you would ruin him; that he would be buying automobiles and buying the comforts of life and he would be putting on airs. Well, what business is that of yours? The farmer is entitled to buy some of the comforts of life. And if he can be entitled to have an automobile; and if it had not been for Henry Ford he would not have been able to purchase one. When Henry Ford, this great humanitarian of America, commenced to make automobiles in large numbers, the automobile kings gathered around him and said, "Henry, you can sell them for \$1,500, and higher just as easily as you can sell them for \$500. You can make ten times as much money by selling them for the higher price. We will all sell them for the high price." But Henry Ford said, "No. The plain people who work and keep the world going are entitled to have automobiles, and I am going to put them within their reach." And Henry Ford defied the automobile combine and single handed marched out in the open and supplied the farmers of the country and the masses generally with automobiles at a reasonable price; and that is why they have been able to get them at all. If the combination had had its way, as it has in the Fertilizer Trust that I have just discussed in preventing the operation of Muscle Shoals, the plain people never would have had automobiles.

Mr. President, I want everybody to prosper. This Government owes it to every citizen to see that he or she has a fair chance in the struggle for existence. We must have one general standard of conduct and treatment for all, one yardstick by which we will measure all. We want the rich man to be treated right, and the poor man to be treated right. We want the same courtesies extended to both, instead of such a disgusting situation as we have to-day right here in the Capital in the Sinclair incident—where this rich man, who defied his Government, who flung insults in its face, who refused to obey the mandates of the Senate, speaking for the people; who closed his mouth and declined to tell the truth when he had made millions out of stealing oil lands from the Government and then hissed in the face of its constituted authority. Finally the Supreme Court sustained the Senate, and Sinclair, the oil thief, was sent to jail. But we find him having leisure and special privileges there; and to-day the press has been notified by a gentleman in authority down there who feels that he must "look up" to Sinclair that the press of the country will not be permitted any more to go to his cell as they do to other prisoners' cells and write stories about Mr. Sinclair. A poor boy who had stolen a loaf of bread would have received no such protection as that. Some poor man who had fought in defense of himself and his family in the common walks of life would have had no such protection thrown around him as they have thrown about Sinclair, the millionaire prisoner in the Capital of the Nation.

Mr. President, I believe that at no far distant time the day will come in this Nation when those in authority will, by public opinion, be compelled to quit toadying and truckling to these purse-proud and arrogant millionaires. When they become criminals and go to jail let them wear the stripes like other criminals. But here is an effort to create a dollar aristocracy in the prison house for those who steal in big amounts. Those in authority say, in effect: "You can write about all the other prisoners; you can drag the skeleton out of the closet of some poor fellow who never had much of a chance in life, who, hard pressed and desperate, was lodged in jail for some minor offense; you can write about him, but do not you approach the cell of Sinclair. He is an oil king and millionaire. You must not disturb him. He may be taking a nap."

[Laughter.]

Oh, Mr. President, these things are so disgusting; and on the same line and in parallel with it some of you have plenty of time to wait on the mighty rich. The big eastern captain of industry gets all he wants. The aluminum king waves his hand, and the tariff that he asks for is granted; but when the toilers of the country—the farmers of the land, who are an indispensable portion of our citizenship—come and ask, "Won't you cut in two the money gathered through the tariff provisions upon agricultural products that come into our country in competition



with that which we produce at home, and sold here in the home market—won't you let us have the debenture plan which would cut the 42 cents a bushel on wheat in half and apply 21 cents a bushel on wheat exported and 2 cents a pound on American cotton that we export? Won't you do that?" "No; oh, no," you say; "why that is granting you a special favor. We can not think about doing that." But you will put a high tariff rate on some things—and you have done it—so high that the article against which you levy the tariff can not come in at all; and if that tariff rate advances the price of that article a dollar, and a hundred million of the articles made here are sold in the United States, that dollar increase in price goes into the pocket of the captain of industry here, and he gets a hundred million dollars and the Government does not get a cent, because the article in question ceases to come in and competition is dead.

Mr. President, I repeat I am heartily in favor of the debenture plan. I think the farmers ought to have this 21 cents a bushel on the wheat that is exported, and I think the farmers of the South and California ought to have this 2 cents a pound on cotton. Why not? That would help the farmers a great deal in my State. The farmers of Alabama produce a million bales of cotton, on the average. Two cents a pound, or \$10 a bale, will be \$10,000,000 a year in the pockets of the farmers of my State alone. How many blessings and benefits would that take into the homes of the farmers of Alabama? It would put \$200,000 and more into the pockets of the farmers of my county alone. How many debts could they pay with that? How many of the necessities could they buy from the merchants, and how many of the comforts of life could they obtain?

Mr. President, there are farmers all over the country who are still owing debts that have come down by piecemeal from 1920, when a bunch of thieves got in charge of the money supply of the Nation and manipulated it so that the worst deflation panic that ever cursed the country broke in all its fury upon the cotton farmers when cotton prices fell from 40 cents a pound down to 10 cents a pound, and our farmers lost \$150 a bale on cotton, when they could not borrow money on it at all at the bank, and when the plow mules of the farmers for which they paid the Western men \$250 and \$300 apiece would not bring \$20 in cash at the courthouse door.

These are some of the horrible experiences that the farmers of the country have had. The farmers were in no way responsible for the deflation panic and, of course, were not responsible for the financial distress and disaster into which it plunged them. Now, it is the plain duty of the Government to reach forth its strong and mighty arm and help to put our distressed farmers on their feet again.

Mr. President, what has happened? In the last nine years 2,000,000 farmers have been driven out of the farming business and have lost their homes and farms. Think of that, Senators! That is a sad picture to me—the impoverishing of these people and the breaking up of their homes. I recall a pathetic and pitiful case in Alabama. During the deflation panic of 1920 a farmer, a good friend of mine, in my home county, had a beautiful little home, a white house on the roadside, 80 acres of land or more, 8 or 10 bales of cotton piled up under a shelter near the barn, and three fat hogs just dressed were hanging on a big pole in the back yard the last time I saw his place; three or four mules loping about the lot, fodder in the barn, and several stacks of hay outside, and sirup and meat and corn and the other supplies that he needed. He was doing well. He had gone in debt to make improvements on the place and to meet the requirements of his business on the farm. He had a wife and two children, a boy about 14 and a little girl about 6.

But in 1920, when the deflation panic broke in all its fury and the price of farm products went down far below the cost of production, his debt-paying power was gone, and he was helpless in the hands of conditions that he did not produce and could not prevent. One morning I saw him and his family going by my home at Lafayette, Ala.—going down to Lanett, a splendid cotton-factory town in the county. His wife was sitting up in front in a 2-horse wagon with her little girl surrounded with household goods. The farmer was walking with bowed head behind with his 14-year-old boy, who walked with his head down as he followed the wagon down the road. I hailed the farmer from my front porch and walked out to the road to talk to him. I said, "Where are you going?" He replied, "I am going down to Lanett to work in a cotton mill. I will get a job in the cotton mill and find, if I can, some kind of work in town for my boy." I inquired if he was giving up his farm. He said, "Tom, I have lost it. I have lost everything. I am worse off than I was eight years ago. I have no property left, and I am still in debt." Then the tears came in his eyes as he said, "My boy took it harder than any of us. This morning when we were leaving the home where we had all been so

happy and contented he was the last to pass out at the yard gate. He looked back at the house as he closed the gate, and turning said to me, with tears in his eyes, 'Papa, what does all this mean?' And I ask you, what does all this mean?" And, Mr. President, I asked the Senate what it all meant during the hard and successful fight I made here single handed to drive from the head of the Federal Reserve Board Governor Harding, who helped to bring upon our country the panic that impoverished American farmers and left hundreds of thousands of them penniless and homeless.

Mr. President, as I have said here before, there was no excuse on earth for that miserable panic. It was deliberately planned. Those who brought it about did so for the purpose of robbing certain classes of people and making millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, and it did exactly what they expected it would do. The use of this Government's instrumentalities for such a diabolical and damnable purpose is both cruel and criminal. But that fact did not deter those who were going to profit by the panic. Mr. President, I am certain in my own mind that Governor Harding tipped off Wall Street gamblers that this deflation panic was ready to break, and when he did it every man who sold cotton, grain, or stocks on the exchange had nothing to do but to have a wheelbarrow ready to haul off his winnings at the close of the day. There was no chance to lose. When the panic broke upon us the bottom fell out of the market, and down and down went prices. So when he and his fellow conspirators precipitated that panic the crash came and Republican leaders of that day and Wall Street bankers raked in their millions and hundreds of millions from speculation on grain and cotton and stocks.

What else? Liberty bonds were sold at a hundred cents on the dollar to our people to help win the war, and the people were told by the Government officials that they would always be able to get a hundred cents on the dollar for them. I saw them in my State, and so did you in yours, sell those bonds for \$80 and \$85 on the hundred. I saw farmers at the bank trying to borrow money on them, and the bank would say, "Governor Harding has said not to lend any money on these Government bonds. You will have to sell them." Governor Harding would not let the banks loan on bonds. The question was asked: "Who will buy them?" And they were told that certain people up here in Wall Street would buy them. Get in touch with certain agents. And they sold those bonds at \$80 and \$85 on the hundred, and those bonds went to New York, and they are there to-day, and the people who once owned them are impoverished; the people who got them so cheaply are clipping their coupons in their idleness and ease, and they are using the millions they are making on them, the interest that the Government is paying, to create a gambling orgy in New York the like of which has never afflicted any other country under the sun. To-day Monte Carlo pales into insignificance compared with that gambling hell in Wall Street. Millions and hundreds of millions lost daily; yes, a billion lost in one day a little while ago.

What care they for wrongs and crimes?  
It is dimes and dollars, dollars and dimes.

The people back in the States in some localities are having a hard time to get the money to meet their business requirements. Why? Because in some instances when they ask for loans necessary for the conduct of their business at home, some of the bankers say, "We can get 12 per cent for money in New York." Mr. President, the farmer can not afford to pay that. And there we have a problem to solve. The gambling dens of New York call the money out of legitimate channels; the farmer, the laborer, the merchant, and other people in the community are doing the things necessary to keep the honest business of the Nation going and they are denied the money needed in their daily avocations, while the money of the country, the life blood of business, flows to the gambling center to supply the leeches and the parasites of society who gamble on watered stocks and fictitious stuff called "cotton" and "grain" to beat down the price of real cotton and grain in the hands of the farmer.

When the farmer goes to the market place with his wheat he says, "I must have a price that will yield a profit. I will hold my wheat until the price is profitable." Then the wheat gamblers go upon the exchange and the broker makes upon the blackboard certain chalk marks—it means the sale of a million bushels of wheat, and they do not own a single bushel of wheat. They only use the name of wheat to beat down the price of real wheat, that the farmer is holding for a better price, and they sell it in unlimited quantities. It is a gambling deal pure and simple. It is unfair and indefensible, but it fixes the price that the farmer is paid for his wheat. The same thing is true of cotton. The cotton farmer says, "I must



have at least 20 cents a pound or I will lose money on my crop. I will hold my cotton for that price." Then what happens? The cotton speculator goes on the exchange and sells a million bales of fictitious stuff called "cotton." He does not own a bale of cotton and he does not expect to deliver any cotton.

The difference is settled in money between the two gamblers, the buyer and seller, and no cotton changes hands. He sells that fictitious stuff called cotton in a speculative deal against the farmer's actual cotton, the farmer who is holding it off the market and striving honestly to obtain a price that will give him a profit and justify him in remaining in the cotton-producing business. This Government permits the gamblers to sell that stuff in unlimited quantities to beat down the price of the farmer's produce, to prevent him from getting a fair price in the market place. I voted for a bill at the last session of Congress to prevent that very thing, but you defeated it. Three important cotton bills that I had passed by the Senate failed to pass the House at the last session of Congress. And to-day there are lobbyists about this Capitol who are saying, "There is no need for farm relief."

Well, Senators, if driving 2,000,000 farmers from the farm in the last nine years—once happy, prosperous men and women, with their children, in homes they called their own; if the breaking up of these American homes and the driving off of 2,000,000 of once-prosperous farmers will not stir you and appeal to your judgment and conscience, your case is hopeless!

And where have these farmers and their families gone? Driven into the big industrial centers, which are already overcrowded, where there is already a large army of the unemployed. And yet you are driving out of once-gainful occupations upon the farm industrious men and women, the bone and sinew of the Nation; you are driving them into the overcrowded cities, to do what? To live there? No. To eke out a miserable existence. You have robbed them of their homes and farms and you have broken their spirits and taken hope out of their hearts. They sit and think of brighter and better days. They think of the time they owned their homes and farms. Yes; and they think of the time when that dreadful panic came and drove them to the wall, when the hammer fell, and old Shylock, the money lord, drove them out with their children down the road, empty handed, into the city to be swallowed up in strange conditions distasteful and horrible to them. That is the pitiful and heart-rending situation, and still they tell us that there is no farm problem; and when we suggest a remedy for the desperate conditions that we find on the American farm they tell us it is paternalism.

Pray tell me what sort of an "ism" is it that is driving these farm people into squalor and want in the big cities? Tell me what "ism" it is that drives these unhappy fathers and mothers out of the home, with their sad children trailing behind them, giving up forever the old house at home and its happy surroundings where they were born and where their ancestors before them lived?

The Bible says, "Harden not your hearts." Senators, surely there is in us enough pity and sympathy left for distressed and opposed humanity to cause us to respond to the farmer's cry for deliverance from the forces that rob him of the fruits of his toil. Will that cry go unanswered by Senators here who have it in their power to grant relief? Mr. President, we have laws to punish those who hold up the citizen and rob him of his money or other thing of value. And yet the farmer is being held up and robbed by the various agencies employed by grain and cotton gamblers. On yesterday the price of cotton broke a dollar a bale; that is, \$5,000,000 on 5,000,000 bales of unsold cotton. It was gambling in fictitious stuff called cotton that broke the price of the farmer's cotton. It was a wager between two gamblers. Two forces were at work there, each trying to fleece the other, and robbing the farmer on his farm when he is not selling any cotton at all. The price has been breaking steadily. The farmer has lost \$15 or \$20 a bale during the selling season. Senators, we can not produce cotton for less than 20 cents a pound. It ought to sell for 25 cents. The present price is unsatisfactory and unprofitable. Does the statistical position of cotton warrant the present low price? Not at all. What about the consumptive demand for cotton? It is greater than it has been for years. What about the supply? It is smaller than it has been for years.

Mr. President, Senators will remember that I claimed here last December that the Government had overestimated the cotton crop. I said then the Government estimate was too large, and the final Government figures showed that I was right. The Government had overestimated it by 104,000 bales, and yet when it was announced that the cotton crop was below the Government's estimate it did not advance the price of cotton as it should have done. I repeat, the cotton farmer is entitled to receive a price that will cover the cost of production and

give him a profit. All the facts about cotton justify him in demanding that. Cotton is being put to more uses to-day than ever before. Time was when cotton was made into bed sheets, pillow slips, and cheap goods of a coarse texture for wearing apparel, and that was about all. But to-day it is being put to a multitude of uses. Cotton is not only in competition with wool, silk, and linen but it is a substitute for all three of them.

Prior to the World War, wood cellulose was the greatest explosive material known, but through experiments the allied nations found that cotton was the principal ingredient in the most powerful explosive in all the world. So cotton is being used now to make nearly everything under the sun. They are making of cotton a cloth called mercerized cotton. It resembles silk so cleverly that only an expert can tell the difference. Handkerchiefs made of cotton just like the one I have here [indicating] made from one bale of cotton, sell for \$750. Cotton socks, at 25 cents a pair, made from one bale of cotton, sell for \$800. A Frenchman in Paris made a bale of cotton into fine laces and sold the finished product for \$1,400. And yet the farmer who produces this cotton is forced to sell it at unprofitable prices. And still there are those here about the Capitol who say there is no necessity for farm relief. Mr. President, something has got to be done to enable the farmer to obtain a price that will give him a profit on the cotton that he produces.

I had a talk with a farmer in my State whose case was similar to that of thousands of other farmers. He said: "I took four bales of cotton to market. The price of cotton had fallen \$15 a bale in a week's time. And it was off \$2.50 a bale more on the day that I reached the market. I was very blue. The merchant to whom I owed a lot of money, said, 'John, the cotton situation is bad and I don't see any sign of improvement in the near future.' Cotton had been bringing above 15½ cents. I wanted to buy some things to take home to my wife and children. When I told the merchant what I desired to do, he said, 'Don't you think you had better wait and do that a little later on? You had better apply this cotton to what you owe on your debts of last year and this year. You remember, I helped you along last year and carried some of your indebtedness over when cotton prices were low and unprofitable and you must help me some with the cotton you have brought to-day. Wait until later in the season when you have paid more on your accounts before you buy anything to take home.'

"I would like for you to have the goods now, but I will go broke if the farmers coming in with cotton do not pay their accounts." While I knew there was sound sense in what he said, I was anxious to keep my promise to my wife and children. I told him they would be looking for the things and would be disappointed. He said, 'You put them off and do that later.' I got in the empty wagon and drove home. I knew what I would see and how I would feel when I looked into the faces of my disappointed children. I reached the hilltop near home a little after sundown, and when the children heard the rattle of the wagon coming slowly down the long hill they ran up the road to meet me, and what a trying ordeal it was when I heard them shouting, 'Here comes daddy with our things from town.' They climbed up into the wagon body and saw that it was empty. They said, 'Daddy, where are our things you promised to bring?' A lump was in my throat. I could not speak, and they commenced to cry. They reminded me that cold weather was coming and that I had promised to bring them shoes and hats and clothes, and that I had not kept my promise. I was never so blue and unhappy in my life. They were crying like their hearts would break when I drove up to the house, and my wife, God bless her, came out and said, 'Children, don't cry like that. Daddy is going back to town again in a few days, and then he will get your things. Don't cry; mother will see that you get the things daddy promised.' I was so glad to see her take that stand. If she had joined with the children and had complained I don't believe I could have stood it." He said, "That night we sat in front of the fire and I heard my disappointed children cry themselves to sleep. It was a sad and bitter experience. They had remained out of school and helped to make the crop, and I had promised to give them the things they wanted out of the first cotton sold, and I was not able to make good my promise. I finally said to my wife, 'I am not sure that I will be able to get the children the things they need the next time I sell cotton, or even the next. I am so sorry for them and so blue and despondent I don't know what is to become of us! The future is so dark.' She gave me a stern look and said, 'John, don't you talk like that. That is not like you. The situation is sad and deplorable, but it will not always be this way. We will come out of it somehow. Hope on, pray on, and fight on. Don't give up. I will stand by you and we will win.' God bless her. I tried to tell her, but she will never

fully know how much her words meant to me. She saved me when I was about to sink."

Senators, I thought of the poem:

The greatest battle that ever was fought,  
Shall I tell you where and when?  
On the map of the world you will find it not,  
It was fought by the mothers of men.

He concluded his story by saying, "Tom, that is the story of the average farmer's experience in the Cotton Belt when prices are low and we can not pay our debts and provide the necessities of life for our loved ones." And yet, Mr. President, in spite of these sad and mournful experiences on the farm, there are Senators here and prominent citizens outside who say there is no necessity for enacting farm-relief legislation. May the God of justice open their minds to the truth and incline their hearts to the agricultural needs of our country.

Why should not the Government do the thing necessary to enable the farmer to obtain a fair price for his products? The Master said, "The laborer is worthy of his hire," and he is. Certainly those who feed and clothe the earth's teeming millions are entitled to receive prices that will yield a profit. The Government renders the farmer aid in other respects. It furnishes valuable information and sends out expert agriculturists and farm demonstrators and they have done a wonderful work. I helped to create and put into operation that service. The Government teaches the farmer how to grow more than he ever grew before on 1 acre of ground. It teaches him scientific and intensive farming, how to make "the earth yield her increase" and produce in abundance, and then at the harvest time he comes out with a good crop and a fine yield. He is feeling good. Then he goes to the market place to receive his reward in profitable prices for his produce that the world must have in order to be fed and clothed. He has put forth his best efforts and worked hard to provide well for those dependent upon him and to lay aside something for a rainy day. He enters the market place with the fruits of his year's investment and toil buoyant and hopeful. But what happens? He is met by the gamblers—wolves of Wall Street—who begin to hiss and howl at his demand for profitable prices. He says, "What is the trouble here?" And they reply, "You have made a big crop and produced too much, and we are going to holler 'overproduction' and beat the price down and punish you for working hard and trying to produce food and clothing for human beings that God has made in His own image." That is what is being done to the farmer, and it is not being done to any other class.

Let me remind you again, Senators, that the Government has taught the farmer how to prepare his soil, cultivate his growing crop, and produce more per acre than ever before, and now it is the duty of the Government to help him as it has helped citizens engaged in other American industries to obtain a price for his products that will induce him and justify him in continuing to produce for the people at home and abroad the actual necessities of life. The Government owes it to the farmer to grant the relief asked for in this bill so as to enable him to get rid of the highwaymen who rob him of his profits every year when he comes to sell his crop. I am counting on great good to come from the efforts of the proposed Federal farm board which is authorized to assist in expanding the home market and the foreign market for our farm products. I would vote for it if it contained no other provision but that, because that will greatly aid the American farmer by expanding the market for what the farmer has to sell, and this board will inform the public what the farmer has to sell and it will acquaint the farmer in various localities just what the demand is for all kinds of farm products. Untold good will come from that provision alone.

All right-thinking people realize that the farming industry is entitled to be placed upon a profitable basis along with other profitable industries in the United States. There is another provision that I helped to put in the bill that will greatly benefit the farmer, and that is the provision under which he can get 85 per cent of the market value of his product in a loan from the Government fund. That will help him to hold his products off the market when the price is unprofitable. That is going to be a glorious thing for the cotton farmer. Now he goes to a bank sometimes which is dominated by those directly interested in the manufacture of cotton goods. The manufacturer wants to buy the raw material cheaply, which is natural, and therefore he is not enthusiastically interested in loaning money to the producer to boost the price of cotton, so the farmer has difficulty in getting money on his cotton to enable him to hold his cotton off the market for a better price. I thank God that this provision is here, that we can relieve him of the embarrassment of even asking those who want to beat

the price down to accommodate him and help him put the price up. Naturally their interests are different. He does not have to do that under the terms of this bill. He can go to this Federal farm board and get 85 per cent of the value of his farm products and hold them off the market and sell them sparingly, intelligently, and keep the market keen and hungry instead of being forced to throw it all on the market at once and depress the price.

That is another good provision in this bill, Mr. President. When the farmer goes to sell his crop he needs all the help he can get. That is the time the robbers of various descriptions swoop down upon him. Let me give you an apt illustration of just how the farmer is robbed of his crop in the market place: I was hunting down near the old Heflin home in Randolph County, Ala., in the month of October. I sat down on the side of a not-much-used old-settlement road, and it was covered with leaves and pine straw. It was near the noon hour and the weather was warm and pleasant. Winged insects were flying hither and thither. Ants were crawling everywhere. I saw a dirt dauber crossing the road, bringing a green worm to his family in the house of clay he had built on the roof of an old tree. This dirt dauber, which looks something like a wasp, was coming home with provisions for his family, and just as he got within 12 or 15 inches of home a green lizard jumped off a little hickory sapling and took the worm away from the dirt dauber and gulped it down. The dirt dauber was angry and indignant. But he had been robbed before, and in a moment he was off again in search of something else with which to feed his family. He had to bring food until he satisfied the gluttony of the lizard before he was permitted to pass the highwayman with anything for his family.

That is the situation we have to-day in the cotton and grain markets of the country. When the southern farmer gets his cotton ready for the market and seeks to sell it at a price that will enable him to pay his debts, and take something home to his family, the speculative market wolves and vultures crowd about him. They hold him up and rob him, and he, too, goes home to his family empty handed. The same thing happens to the grain grower. The farmer who brings his grain to the market finds these same speculative monsters there ready to rob him. They force him to sell his grain below the cost of production and they drive him out of the market empty handed and on home in an empty wagon with nothing for his family, and with debts hanging over his head for another year. Senators, that miserable and ungodly system has got to be destroyed. It is not only outrageous, wrong, and criminal; it is hurtful and dangerous to good government in America. It impoverishes and breaks the morale of our farmers, and in so doing weakens and impairs the Government itself.

The farmer toils early and late. He plows the ground in the wintertime. He plows when frequently the ground is almost to the freezing point. He endures the hardships of the cold, and in the heat of summer he toils. He toils the year through. He stays with his crop until it is harvested, and then goes with it to the market place, where he is entitled to receive a profitable price and where he must receive such a price if he is to succeed in the business of farming. But he finds an organized force of market manipulators lying in wait for him. They represent the speculative interests of Wall Street. They beat down the price of cotton and grain on the exchanges and wire the results of their gambling deal into every local market in the country and the price thus fixed becomes the local price. And through the prices thus fixed the farmer is robbed in the market place, and that is what we intend to stop by this legislation.

Mr. President, I am reminded of what an old fisherman told me about a fish hawk. He said that "the fish hawk who watched the waves of the sea when the great schools of fish were moving along and gliding into the open space between two rolling waves, the fish hawk would risk his life darting into the open space and catching a fish to take to his offspring out on the land." The eagle who had been sitting on a mountain crag watching the fish hawk working hard and risking his life to provide food for himself and his young, darted swiftly down toward the fish hawk. He would let forth a terrific scream, frighten the fish hawk, who would drop the fish. The eagle flew down and caught the fish and bore it back to his retreat upon the mountain, where he feasted upon it to his heart's content."

That, Mr. President, is exactly what the cotton and grain speculators are doing to the farmers of the United States. They watch and wait for the marketing season of cotton and grain and, like the eagle who swooped down upon the fish hawk and robbed him of his fish, these crafty and avaricious men swoop down upon the farmer and, through their market manipulations, rob him of his cotton and grain.



And what is the result? The farmer sells his crop at unprofitable prices. His year's work is gone and his business has failed. And then in time what follows? The farmer's home and farm are sold and he and his family, stripped of their substance, are forced to go away from the place where they wanted to live and die, and start life over again amongst strangers in surroundings that are entirely distasteful to them. But even in the face of these sad and sickening conditions in the farm life of America, some Senators tell us there is no farm problem and no necessity for farm relief!

God help them to see the error of their way. Senators, you have heard it suggested here that a new order of things is to come—that the idle rich will buy up a large portion of the farms that are forced upon the market through the foreclosure of mortgages, farms that were once the happy habitation of a prosperous farming class. And the plan is to let those farms grow up in grass and weeds and trees for the purpose of making hunting preserves for those to hunt and revel who have made their money out of the sweat and blood of the hard-working and once prosperous farmers of our country. But that is not all. We are told that another plan of the money lords is to buy up millions of acres of farm lands sold under mortgage and establish a system of "chain farming" in the United States. They intend to bring into our country hundreds of thousands of foreigners and put them upon these farms once owned and cultivated by patriotic American farmers. These foreigners to be placed upon farms owned by the feudal lords of the East are to grow crops cheaply for their masters, which are to be sold in competition with farm products produced by American farmers. Thank God they have got to change the immigration law before they can do such an unfair and un-American thing. I shall fight such a proposition to the uttermost.

Senators, you now have the opportunity to do something that will put hope in the hearts of the distressed farmers of America. Will not this Congress now do something that will enable farmers who still own their farms to continue to own them, and open the way for every farmer under the flag to have the opportunity of buying and living on a farm that he can call his own? Who can say that such an arrangement would not be just and fair, and who can say that such an arrangement would not be best for the people of the United States? I believe that the intelligent and conscientious people of the United States want Congress to do something to relieve the farmers and their families from the unfair and distressing conditions that afflict and impoverish them to-day.

Mr. President, we owe it to the farmers of the country to do that. The more money the farmer receives for his produce the more he has to pay to the merchant and manufacturer for their goods. We are told that the price of labor is higher here in mine, workshop, and factory than it is in foreign countries. That is true, when we count the price paid to the individual laborer. The wage paid to him here is higher than that paid to the laborer abroad, but we must also consider the important fact which so many Senators overlook, that the average trained workman in the United States does many times as much work in a day and turns out many times as much material as does the foreign laborer, and the result of his day's work in benefiting financially his employer is ten times, or more that of the laboring man in Europe.

The more money the laboring man here has, the more money he has with which to buy the necessities and comforts of life; the better able he is to pay a good price for what he buys from the farmer and from the merchant; the better able he is to educate his children and to provide as he should for those who are dependent upon him. I am not in favor of allowing the cheap laborers of Europe to come here and take the places of the American laboring man and woman. I would not for a moment permit foreign laborers to come here and drive from profitable employment American laboring men and women. Neither will I permit the cheap products of foreign labor to come here free of import duty and rob the farmer, manufacturers, and the laboring men and women of America of the benefits that should come from a prosperous home market.

Mr. President, I have never been a free trader. I am going to vote as I have done before for import duties or a tax on vegetable oils that come into our American markets to help beat down the price of cottonseed oil. I am going to vote for a tariff tax against foreign graphite and for a tax on foreign peanuts. I am not willing for the pauper labor of Europe that can produce vegetable oils and peanuts in abundance to ship them here on boats which charge but a small ocean freight rate and undersell those who produce cottonseed oil and other vegetable oils and peanuts in our own country and put them out of business. I am not going to do that. I may be at cross purposes with some of the members of my party. I want to be consistent.

I do not intend that any foreign country, by sending their people here in person, shall take the places of Americans and drive from employment the laboring men and women of our country. I am not going to permit them to produce commodities there by pauper labor or economic slave conditions and ship them here and put our wage earners and farmers out of business in the homeland. Now, that is my position upon that phase of the question; and I stand ready to defend it here and elsewhere.

Mr. President, the Government can assist the farmer in another important way, and that is in putting to use the waste products of the farm. A distinguished German scientist once said that there was enough farm material wasted in the United States to support some of the smaller European nations, and no doubt that is true. The Government has furnished expert agents to go to the great mining camps of our country to teach the miners how to utilize the waste products of the mines; and that is right and proper. The Government has sent its expert agents to the smelting establishments and to the great iron and steel plants, and has taught them how to turn their waste material into profitable products, and that was right and proper. Now, I am asking the Government to turn its attention to the waste products of the farm. I want it to teach our farmers how to utilize the things that are going to waste upon the farms of the United States.

It has already been demonstrated by experiments right here in the Department of Agriculture that print paper can be made of cotton stalks and cornstalks. I had here at my desk just a few weeks ago a big daily newspaper which was printed on paper made from cornstalks. I also had samples of paper made from cotton stalks. The whole stalk, bark, and limbs are used. They are treated with a chemical solution and pounded into pulp preparatory to making it into sheets of paper. Millions of tons of cotton stalks are going to waste every year. They can be cut close to the ground with machinery and baled like hay as soon as the cotton is picked, and the farmer can make some money out of cotton stalks now going to waste.

Just here, Mr. President, I want to read to the Senate a statement of Prof. O. R. Sweeney, of the State Agricultural College, Ames, Iowa, made before the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member. He was talking about making print paper from cornstalks and cotton stalks.

Senator HEFLIN. But cornstalk pulp would have fiber enough in it to make paper like newsprint or better?

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes, sir; better than newsprint. I do not believe we have ever made paper from the fiber standpoint as bad as newsprint. You can take this sample I have here and tear a piece of it and you will see it is beautiful.

Senator HEFLIN. The fiber in this sample of paper you show me is cornstalks, as I understand, and it is stronger than wood, is it not?

Mr. SWEENEY. Well, they have made it as strong as wood. We made that, and it is made of the strongest material.

Senator HEFLIN. What color was this before you bleached it?

Mr. SWEENEY. A sort of golden yellow.

Senator HEFLIN. Do you grind the whole cornstalks?

Mr. SWEENEY. We put them in a large kettle and subject them to a pressure of from 20 to 60 pounds, and then blow that out onto the floor, and we cook that with caustic soda.

Senator HEFLIN. That is, cornstalks as you take them out of the field?

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes, sir.

Senator HEFLIN. You feed this pulp stuff in between two big rollers and they flatten it out like that you show us?

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes, sir.

Senator HEFLIN. Have you experimented with cotton-stalk pulp?

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes, sir; to some extent. You can ask the Department of Agriculture about that, which has made paper from cotton stalks and short cotton fiber.

Senator HEFLIN. Yes, sir; I have seen some of it.

Mr. SWEENEY. There is now no question about cotton stalks making paper.

Senator HEFLIN. Print paper or wrapping paper or cardboard.

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes, sir.

Senator HEFLIN. You know, perhaps, that the farmer clears off his cornstalks every year, and so do the cotton planters clear off their cotton stalks, before they plant a new crop.

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes, sir.

Senator HEFLIN. And if this matter could be developed whereby cornstalks and cotton stalks could be used in abundance, it would be a great help to the farming industry of the United States and perhaps go a long way toward preserving our forests.

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes, sir; and that is a very interesting and important matter.

Now, Mr. President, since it is certain that print paper, wrapping paper, and cardboard, or pasteboard as we call it, can be made from cotton stalks and cornstalks, it is the duty of



Congress to appropriate the money necessary to establish in the cotton and corn growing States the demonstrative proof that paper can and should be made from cotton and corn stalks. I shall join the Senators from the Corn Belt at the next regular session of Congress in an effort to pass the legislation necessary, and I believe that I can pledge in advance the support of most of the Senators from the cotton-growing States.

I can remember when corn was used only to make bread for human beings and feed for stock; but now we make corn flakes, corn oil, cornstarch, corn sirup, corn sugar, and many other commodities that I could mention. That is why corn ought to bring more than it brought in the old days when it was only used as bread for man and food for his beast. I remember when millions of tons of cottonseed were thrown away every year. And what a waste of farm products it was! My father was a farmer and a country doctor. He owned a cotton gin and a corn mill and a wheat mill, all in the same building. People who brought their cotton there to have it ginned would leave the seed with him. They took home enough to plant the next year and left the others as something worthless. But now what do we see? By man's inventive genius a little gin with fine saws has been invented which cuts the fuzzy jacket off the seed, and flinters white like the driven snow come from our cottonseed, a million bales a year. The hull is removed from the seed and used as a cow feed and for other purposes. They extract the oil from the seed and then grind the cottonseed into meal. The meal is used as feed for cattle and hogs and makes a splendid fertilizer. The oil from the seed is a substitute for olive oil; and cottolene, to a large extent, takes the place of lard. Millions of tons of it are now being used for food. And that is not all. They have discovered a glycerin substance in cottonseed oil that is excellent for use in the manufacture of explosives. There are many other ways in which the products of the cottonseed are being used. I merely mention a few of them to show why the cotton farmer should get a better price for his cottonseed. And I am of the opinion that this farm relief bill is going to help him do that.

Mr. President, there is hardly an industry but you find cotton used in it somewhere. Take the trunk and valise industry—cotton is used for lining and covering. The airplane that flies aloft bears cotton in its wings; the automobile carries cotton in its upholstery and in its tops and tires. Cotton is used for making wearing apparel of every description, including hats and shoes. It is found in the rubber belting used by every industry under the sun. The cement industry comes into being, and millions of cotton sacks are required for its use. Cotton in some form is in every home in the civilized world.

I am giving you some of the reasons why the farmer should receive a better price for cotton than he is receiving to-day. Here is what the Department of Agriculture says about cotton:

The rise in the cost of the raw material is more the result of natural rather than artificial causes. There has been a material advance in practically all commodities, and cotton has shared in this.

But in the case of cotton this advance has also been furthered by a constantly broadening demand for this fiber in old as well as new channels. Cotton is now relied upon in practically all of the textile manufactures, either as a primary or a secondary material, and it is utilized in an increasing number in all other manufacturing industries.

Then the department closes with this statement:

The ease and rapidity with which the cotton fiber is transformed into yarn and its adaptability for all forms of woven fabrics are responsible for the manner in which it has outstripped all other fibers and for its increasing use.

And, Mr. President, cotton brings more gold into the United States every year than the world's annual output and gives to us the balance of trade. Cotton has done more to maintain America's credit abroad and to keep it on a sound financial basis than all other commodities combined. The failure of no one crop would so affect the world as the failure of the cotton crop. Millions of people would be thrown out of employment and millions more would suffer and shiver in the cold. In the catalogue of commodities cotton is the master production, the most readily cashed, and the most widely consumed among the great staples of the earth. Cotton is the only product in the kingdom of agriculture every pound of which is converted into money and every dollar's worth of which contributes to the financial wealth of the United States.

And yet in spite of the vast and increasing uses to which cotton is being put, the cotton producers of the United States are to-day selling cotton at unprofitable prices, when the cotton supply is small and the demand for cotton is great, and more cotton is being consumed than ever before in the history of cotton production. Senators, there is something radically wrong. No fair-minded, honest man can deny that our farmers are being deprived of profitable prices for their produce. And

I appeal to Senators from every section to vote for this farm relief bill. It provides a revolving fund of \$500,000,000 to aid American farmers in marketing their products at profitable prices. Let us extend a helping hand to the farmers of our country who toil year in and year out in producing the where-with to feed and clothe the world. All honor to these producing masses. They woo the soil and obtain its secrets. They stir it with plow and hoe and make it yield its increase. In the language of Eliza Cook:

There's glory in the shuttle's song;  
There's triumph in the anvil's stroke;  
There's merit in the brave and strong  
Who dig the mine or fell the oak.

I doubt if he who lolls his head  
Where idleness and plenty meet  
Enjoys his pillow or his bread  
As those who earn the meals they eat.

Hold up your brow in honest pride,  
Though rough and swarth your hands may be!  
Such hands are sap-veins that provide  
The lifeblood of the nation's tree.

I plead for fair treatment for the farmers of the Nation. And I insist that it is the duty of the Government to do as much for the agricultural industry as it has already done for the manufacturing industry.

Mr. President, these Senators who come from the big cities, some of whom have already made up their minds to vote against this debenture plan, want to keep the farmer in the condition he is in because otherwise they think the consumer will have to pay a little more. Suppose he does, the increased volume of money that will flow into the channels of business from a prosperous agricultural class will many times offset the increase in the price. The consumer will be benefited instead of being injured by it. The business of the American farmer must again become a prosperous business. The American farm must again be made an inviting place to live. With profitable prices for farm products and household conveniences necessary, life on the farm is the most desirable and the happiest existence that a normal American can have.

You who live in the big cities, wake up in the morning at the grating noise of an alarm clock pounding in your ears, or you listen to a whistle blow, but the farmer hears the fascinating music of roosters crow. Have you ever spent the night on a farm in the country and witnessed the coming of the dawn? Daybreak upon the farm—oh, it is a glorious time! I was reared on the farm and I love to repeat the little poem:

When a boy I used to dwell,  
In the home I loved so well,  
Far away among the clover and the bees;  
Where the morning glory vine,  
Round the cabin door did twine,  
And the mocking bird sang among the trees.

Since I have been in the Senate, I have had the pleasure frequently of spending the night with some farmer friend in Alabama. I recall with pleasure the last night I spent on an Alabama farm. The moon was shining bright and near my window a mocking bird in a cedar tree festooned with honeysuckles was singing sweetly. Under the spell of his enchanting music I fell asleep. And in the early morning, long before the sun got up or daylight appeared upon the earth, I heard the clarion voice of that unfailing prophet of the dawn, the rooster in the barnyard as he proclaimed the approach of day and announced that it was time for everybody to get up. Then I heard the chatter of English sparrows in the trees, and turkeys, chickens, geese, and guineas were sounding forth thanksgiving for the coming of another day. And I heard the noise of cooking utensils in the kitchen and in a little while I heard fresh eggs popping in hot grease and smelled the sweet aroma of frying country ham as it floated out on the morning air.

I heard the pigs squealing, calves bleating, the cows lowing, and the horses nickering as the farmer went out to feed his stock. It was broad day and all was bustle and stir about the place now. A glorious breakfast is served. The farmer and his boys are off to the field and the work of the day is begun. In a little while the good wife is in the garden amongst her vegetables, making ready for the noontime meal for her husband and sons when they return at midday. And I saw the farmer moving to and fro across the field and I heard the caw, caw of the crow as the farmer and his boys opened the furrows in the field, and the birds flew down to pick up the insects and worms that were turned up by the farmer's plow. Throughout the livelong day the farmer plows and toils in the field. And when the sun has gone down he returns to his home. The cows are coming

up from the pasture and the calves are bleating deep-mouthed welcome as they come.

And when the farmer and his family have had their evening meal they sit on the front porch and listen to the whippoorwill in the woods near by and to the katydids and crickets as they give their evening concert. And then at bedtime they listen to that master musician, the mocking bird, as he pours out his soul in song. Then family prayer is had and the little ones say good night!

My heart goes out in sincere sympathy to the American farmer and his family. God help us to-day to do justice by the farmers of our country. No truer patriot and no braver man lives than these dependable, sturdy Americans who make up the agricultural army of this Nation. God speed the day when the farmer and his family can have and enjoy the fruits of their toil and when the American farm home shall again become an ideal and a fascinating place in which to live. Senators, there is no spot of earth more delightful and enjoyable than a prosperous and hospitable home on a southern farm. I have been there when red slices of ham were swimming in red gravy and fine fluffy biscuits with rich yellow butter oozing from their sides reveled in a plate of sugar-cane sirup! Talk about living on the fat of the land! Fried chicken, waffles, eggs, and everything worth while. They had it when farm products were selling at profitable prices, and you were welcome to it. It was glorious to be there.

But many of these old farms where prosperity once abounded have passed from the hands of the farmer and some of those farm homes are deserted. I have in mind one farm home in particular in Alabama where happiness and contentment dwelt and prosperity and hospitality abounded. But the deflation panic of 1920 came and destroyed its prosperity and paralyzed the hand of its hospitality. And the voice of gloom and despair was heard where joy and gladness used to dwell. The farmer and his family are gone. Yes; they all are gone!

Mr. President, the robber system that deprives the farmer of profitable prices destroys the farmer's business, and the system that does that deprives once prosperous farmers of their homes and farms; and it is not only the farmer's enemy but it is the dangerous enemy of free and fair government in America. The Government destroyed the pirates on the high seas who used to hold up and rob American ships, and I submit that it is the duty of the Government now to put out of business the agents of Wall Street who rob and impoverish the American farmer when he brings the fruits of his year's work, his farm products, to market.

Senators, let us by our votes show the farmer that we who have been sent here to do justice to all classes are not only willing at all times but are determined to give the farmer a fair chance in the struggle of life and to aid him in receiving what he has a right to receive—a price for his products that will cover the cost of production and give him a profit. Let us show our determination to stand by the American farmer and to fight for him until he is relieved of the Wall Street marauders that hold him up and rob him every year during the marketing season.

Mr. President, I shall cast my vote for this bill. I am going to vote for the debenture plan, and we are going to put it in this bill and I hope we can keep it in. I trust that the Members of the House will see that it is kept in the bill. If they keep it in the bill, it will be worth \$10 a bale to every cotton producer in Alabama and in the South, and God knows they need it. I believe that this farm board, with 12 members on it, can accomplish a great deal, and I do not want the number any less. You talk about an unwieldy board. You are certainly not justified in making that suggestion in the face of the fact that we now have 12 regional banks to serve the general financial needs of the Nation. We have 12 Federal farm banks to serve specific farm-land interests.

Now, why should we not be fair and give the farmers of the whole United States 12 members for this Federal farm board to look after the interests of farmers in every nook and corner of the country. There seems to be a lack of sympathy here for the business of the small farmer. Senators, before I close let me say that the business of the small farmer out in the rural district, far away from the bustle and stir of the big city, means as much to him as the millionaire's business means to him in the heart of Wall Street. And until the Government comes to recognize and to protect the small and large farmers' rights and interests just as it does the millionaire it will fall far short of its duty. The pending bill will give substantial help, because it provides, among other things, a chance for the farmer to insure his farm products against loss. You never heard of anybody being willing to do that before. It must be that the "trade" thinks this bill will do the work. It also

provides, as I said before, that the farmer can borrow 85 per cent of the value of his farm products.

Mr. President and Senators, I have spoken at length on this question in order to acquaint you with the various phases of the farm problem as I know it to be. The downfall of every government in the world commenced with the mistreatment, the robbery, and the oppression of the farmers of the country. They were sinister interests that did it. God Almighty Himself in His Holy Word has demanded a fair deal for the farmer. For God Himself has said, "They shall build houses and inhabit them; they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat."

Mr. JOHNSON obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	La Follette	Smith
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Smoot
Barkley	Gillett	McMaster	Steck
Bingham	Glass	McNary	Steiwer
Black	Glenn	Metcalf	Stephens
Blaine	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Blease	Goldsbrough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Greene	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Burton	Harrison	Patterson	Tyson
Capper	Hastings	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Hedin	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Edge	Kean	Sheppard	
Fess	Keyes	Shortridge	
Fletcher	King	Simmons	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### GIFT OF JOHN GELLATLY TO SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it may be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Smithsonian Institution to convey suitable acknowledgment to John Gellatly for his offer to the Nation of his art collection and to include in its estimates of appropriations such sums as may be needful for the preservation and maintenance of the collection was read twice by its title.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let it be read.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas Mr. John Gellatly has offered to the Nation his art collection for eventual permanent exhibition in the National Gallery of Art under the administration of the Smithsonian Institution; and

Whereas the National Gallery of Art Commission has recommended to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the acceptance of this collection on account of its high merit; and

Whereas the said Board of Regents have approved in principle this recommendation: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Smithsonian Institution is requested to convey suitable acknowledgment to the donor, and is authorized to include in its estimates of appropriations such sums as may be needful for the preservation and maintenance of the collection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this joint resolution is presented pursuant to the advice and approval of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I trust it will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the rule has been rather rigidly enforced during the present session that joint resolutions, having the force and effect of law, should be considered by the appropriate committees. I do not want to become a party to a departure from the practice—

Mr. SMOOT. This joint resolution merely accepts a gift of about \$4,000,000 in value to the Smithsonian Institution, and I thought there would not be any objection to it.

Mr. GEORGE. It carries an appropriation?



Mr. SMOOT. Only an authorization for the appropriation of about \$68,000 hereafter for the preservation and maintenance of the collection.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not going to invoke the rule, but it has been invoked here on other matters.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It has been invoked by the Senator from Utah, but not by myself. I join in the request for the consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

LETTER OF REV. JOHN A. RYAN REPLYING TO SENATOR HEFLIN

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, during the course of the debate a few days ago the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] quoted extensively from publications by Dr. John A. Ryan. Doctor Ryan has written me stating that he believes that a grievous injustice was done him by misrepresentations of his real views. I ask that his letter be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as he requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the article I read was from a paper I think called the Commonweal. I am having it looked up in my office and will say something about it later. I think that Doctor Ryan is mistaken in the part of his letter about my having quoted him as to the Roman Catholics regarding their intentions toward Protestants in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to yield for any discussion at this time. There are several Members of the Senate who desire to be heard upon the farm relief bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not know the Senator had the floor. I was just going to say that I will look the book up and see what the quotations are from. I have no desire to take the Senator off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be printed in the Record, in the absence of objection.

The letter is as follows:

[National Catholic Welfare Conference. Administrative committee, Most Rev. Edward J. Hanna, D. D., chairman; Rev. John J. Burke, C. S. P., general secretary. Department of social action. National headquarters, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW. Right Rev. Thomas F. Lillis, D. D., chairman; Rev. John A. Ryan, director; Rev. R. A. McGowan, assistant director; Linna E. Bresette, secretary for women in industry; Rose J. McHugh, secretary for social surveys; Elizabeth B. Sweeney, secretary for civic education]

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 7, 1929.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I call your attention to the source of some statements derogatory to me which were uttered on the floor of the Senate April 23? These statements were made by the senior Senator from Alabama, but I am confident that he was unaware of the fact that they did me a grievous injustice.

The Senator quoted certain sentences of mine which appeared in an article in the Commonweal April 3; at the same time he attributed to me an assertion which I did not make. Neither in the Commonweal nor elsewhere have I ever said that the Volstead Act "never had a shadow of validity in morals." The words just quoted were specifically restricted in my Commonweal article to those provisions of the Volstead Act which forbid a person to make, possess, and transport liquor for his own use. I pointed out that this portion of the act is no longer enforced by the Federal authorities. According to the Senator, I also discussed in that article the competence of the state to decide moral questions, the authorities whom a Catholic might consult if he were in doubt as to the morality of a civil statute, and the difficulty which the state might encounter in the enforcement of a law to which a large section of the citizens were conscientiously opposed. Not one of these statements occur in my Commonweal article. They are all torn from their context in The State and the Church, by Ryan & Millar, and they were all written eight years ago.

Yet they were all set forth by Senator HEFLIN as extracts from the Commonweal. The Senator was misled by an article in the New York Christian Advocate April 18. This article was written in Washington by the editor of the National Methodist Press and sent out by him apparently to the leading journals of his religious denomination. As already intimated, the article misrepresented my position on the Volstead Act and placed the mutilated passages from The State and

the State immediately after the extracts from the Commonweal. Any unsuspecting reader would naturally infer that all the quotations were taken from the Commonweal and that I had made the statements about consulting priests, bishops, and popes, etc., with specific reference to the prohibition laws. Senator HEFLIN can not fairly be blamed for drawing this inference and thus unwittingly misrepresenting me.

Since this misrepresentation, this distortion of my words, has received a very wide circulation, both through the press and through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, thousands of American citizens have been deceived just as the Senator from Alabama was deceived. Inasmuch as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been made the instrument of misrepresenting me, I am hoping that it may become the means of setting me right.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. RYAN.

#### FARM RELIEF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing, and in the control and disposition of the surplus, of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture upon the skill and the ability with which, in troubled waters, he has piloted this farm bill. I congratulate him, too, sir, upon the industry, the pertinacity, the assiduity, and the ability with which he has followed this very complex and confusing problem during the past few years. To it he has given much. To it he has given everything a legislator desiring to act conscientiously and in behalf of his people can give, and I feel, in the closing moments of the argument upon what is an important part of this bill, that the thanks of this body, indeed, of all those who are interested in agricultural relief, are due to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

I wish to pay him, so far as I can, my full meed of praise. I would like, were it possible for me to do so, to follow him in every aspect of the bill which he has presented, and if the administration of the bill were to be in his hands and his hands alone, I would have no fear for what might be the outcome in the solution of the agricultural problem which has so long vexed the entire Congress and all the people of this Union.

I take it, sir, that in the last campaign, if ever an obligation is incurred by a political party, or individuals who pretend to be a part of a political party, such an obligation was incurred by this side of the Chamber. I take it, in the broader aspect, that if there is ever an obligation upon those who pretend to serve a great people, that obligation rests upon both sides of this Chamber, upon Republicans, upon pseudo-Republicans, upon Democrats, and Republican-Democrats, in this body and elsewhere.

I take it that if we can find any adequate measure by which relief shall be accorded our farming communities, that is a duty which rests upon each and every one of us, and I take it, sir, that all of us desirous of performing our duty will endeavor in his own way and as best he may, to find a way in which we may afford adequate relief to the farming population of the United States.

Mr. President, during the last year bellowed from the hustings, tintinnabulated over the radio, ululated from a servile press, enjoined by presidential proclamation, and resounding from every quarter, has come to us here the oburgation "Agriculture must be placed on an equality with industry."

All united in the generic cry. All insist when we deal in the generality—there is no difference upon it at all—that agriculture must be placed upon an equality with industry. There is no dissonance, Mr. President, in the repetition of the generality. It is only in concreteness that comes cacophony at all. As long as we indulge in merely the generic way of shedding tears for the losses or the sad position of our neighbors, all of us agree. We disagree when we come to point the concrete thing, and this is not unusual in our political life, nor is it unusual in the matter of legislation.

There is a peculiar mutt psychology existing in this land today. It is a psychology, sir, that is satisfied with any indefinite appeal precatory in character and general in language. Press, pulpit, and politician unite in influencing the peculiar psychology that now exists. Of course, those of us who indulge in mystery stories have read of authors who endeavored to paint the perfect crime. None has ever succeeded. We have, however, in the national life of America to-day something of the perfect conspiracy, the conspiracy of press, pulpit, and politician, working its way and exercising its sway over a mutt psychology in the land and putting over exactly what that conspiracy of press, pulpit, and politician desires.

We can understand something of it, perhaps, in a material era such as ours. We can understand that when a people are

engaged in making money alone they have little time to pay attention to their own grave concerns, or to idealism, or to altruism at all. So it is that this singular psychology which now prevails in the United States may perhaps govern us.

This, sir, is the moronic era of the age of "bunk." It is an era, sir, in which I am perfectly willing to recognize I am culpable with others, but at least I am different from some others in admitting it, and I can yet laugh.

The psychology we see evidenced in our everyday occurrences. It is only a day or two ago we read of a so-called night hostess acquitted in a Federal court—God save the mark—in New York City amid the enthusiastic acclaim of a great mass of people. We read recently of a death applauded in legislative halls, like clapping hands as the trap falls at an execution. We read, again, of a great press association meeting in New York City, a great press association which in fear and trembling waited the fateful words of the greatest executive in all the world, and we read how, when he solemnly and courageously declared himself against crime, that great press association rose in its majesty and might and cheered him to the echo.

We read, sir, in the press dispatches from abroad to-day how the United States sits in the repudiated League of Nations at Geneva, and one day says that we favor reduction in naval armaments, and the next day says that the United States acquiesces in peace-time conscription.

What a marvelous psychology, and how it is wrought upon by those who desire that it shall continue, and that it shall respond to concentrated power as we have seen it respond in the last few months.

Here, sir, upon this bill we see something of the same sort. Here, sir, we cry, and from the lips of every man who has spoken upon the subject, and in each Chamber of the Congress, from every particle of the press that deals in its generic characteristics with this problem, we find the cry, "Agriculture must be placed upon an equality with industry." And then, sir, we find that we strain at the only provision in the bill which places agriculture upon an equality with industry and we swallow whole provisions of the bill, if they mean what they say, which go infinitely farther than the one providing for the debenture system.

Because, sir, the bill has not, as I take it, or at least I have not heard it, been analyzed in full so far as this body is concerned, I am going to take just a few moments upon some of its provisions. I call to the attention of my brethren upon this side of the Chamber some of the things the bill provides so that they may never be frightened in their legislative careers in the days to come at the most extravagant provisions for price fixing, for putting the Government into business or for having the Government do everything—"everything" I say advisedly—that private enterprise or private initiative could do. I do not fear such provisions, if they are to be enforced, and I seek to allay future fears of my colleagues.

The bill provides for price fixing first, if it means anything. It provides for barter and sale, buying and borrowing. It provides, if it means anything, for taking the Government into every conceivable business under the sun in connection with agricultural commodities. It provides, sir, if it means anything, for having the Government use everything to put the Government into business in a way ordinarily opposed by those who represent the Republican Party in the Government of the United States. Each time I qualify what I say as to the provisions of the bill by the phrase "if it means what it says."

I repeat that it is language general in character which may some time be construed far, far in the future to mean not what it says at all. But if the language of the bill is the sort that ought to be in a measure of this kind, if the provisions of the bill signify what is the plain import of those provisions, then you have gone into business, you gentlemen who hate the term, taking your Government so far afield in the adventure in business that no other government on earth ever attempted, and none so far as we know has ever attempted it in the Halls of the Congress. The bill either does those things or it does nothing. If it is a piece of rank hypocrisy, if it is a mere fraud, a delusion and a snare, then, of course, we want naught to do with it.

If it does all these things to which I have adverted, then you upon this side of the Chamber who have one philosophy of government, while I have another, may reject it, perhaps, but those who feel as I do upon the subject will congratulate its authors and the administration to-day in having the courage to take hold of the problem and go forward and do for its people whatever may be necessary to be done for their welfare, whether it takes the Government into business, interferes with individual initiative, or whether it does not.

But whether your views are one sort or another, here admittedly is one provision of the bill that does the job, one

provision of the bill that finally brings the relief and the aid to the farmer for which he has been crying before the Congress and the people of the United States these many years in the past. Upon that provision there is no indefiniteness, there is no ambiguity. You may oppose it because it is a bounty. You may say that it is a gift. You may assert that it is a mere bonus to the agricultural industry. But there it is in plain and unmistakable language. There is no ambiguity such as may be argued as to the other provisions of the bill. As I listened to the chairman of the committee in his opening statement I realized there is a provision, adopting his phrase, "that does the job," and the only question is whether you want to do the job. But that is what the debenture proposition does, and nothing less.

It is nonsense to talk about a bounty and a gift and a bonus and the like. Let us look at the bill, you gentlemen who can not be for the debenture proposition because it is a bounty, and let us see what it is you are for as against the bounty provision. If you will follow me with your copies of the bill for a moment, in a very brief period I will run through some of its astounding provisions.

First is the purpose of the bill. What is it? As set forth in lines 5 and 6, page 2, it is "to minimize such price fluctuations by controlling any seasonal or year's total surplus." What do you mean when you say that the purpose of your legislation is "to minimize such price fluctuations by controlling the surplus"? What you mean is that you have a price-fixing measure. There is no escape from that conclusion, none whatever. You have here, first, in the very purpose and policy of the bill a statement that you will fix prices, because under that provision it is the duty of those who are to administer it "to minimize price fluctuations by controlling the seasonal or other total surplus."

Look now at other things that may be done by the bill. I am sorry the limitations of time will not permit me to analyze it as I should have liked, but there are a few provisions of it that I insist shall be understood by the Senate. I insist on it because the times are coming in the Government of this Republic when, appealing to the psychology that exists now, a conspiracy of press, pulpit, and politician may make you believe that things ought not to be done for a people that really could be accomplished, and I want you to know what you are doing by your votes in favor of the measure. I do not want any man in this body hereafter to gag at anything that may be asked of the Government in behalf of the people that may require the Government's aid.

I turn to page 5 simply as indicating the purposes of the bill:

In order that it may secure for such producers the maximum benefits under this act consistent with the policy declared in section 1.

The policy declared in section 1 is to minimize price fluctuations by controlling any seasonal or year's total surplus, and here we are aspiring to obtain the maximum benefit under that policy.

I turn to page 6, paragraph (h). There we find that we—

may cooperate with other governmental agencies and with private agencies in expanding domestic and foreign markets for agricultural commodities or products thereof and in developing by-products of and new uses for agricultural commodities.

Talk of the Government in business. Here we are going to cooperate not only with governmental agencies but with private agencies in expanding the domestic and foreign market and in developing by-products and new uses for agricultural commodities.

I skip, unfortunately, those pages in relation to the mode of formation of stabilization corporations and turn to their powers. On page 10, paragraph (d) we find that—

A stabilization corporation for any agricultural commodity shall have authority to act as a marketing agent for its stockholders or members, and to purchase, handle, store, warehouse, process, sell, and market any quantity of the agricultural commodity or its products, whether or not such commodity or products are acquired from its stockholders or members. Purchases or sales of the agricultural commodity or its products by the stabilization corporation shall be made in the open market in such manner as to effectuate the policy declared in section 1 of this act.

It may be said that it is only the stabilization corporation that is doing any business of this sort, but whence come the funds by which these things may be done? They come, of course, from the Government of the United States and the appropriations that are made by Congress in respect thereto. I come to the provision about dividends, on page 11, and I turn to paragraph (f):

For the purpose of enabling a stabilization corporation to act as an agent in marketing an agricultural commodity or its products acquired



from its stockholders or members, the board may subscribe to the stock of the corporation in such amounts as, in the judgment of the board, are adequate.

Government in business? Oh, you say, "In a left-handed way, perhaps," but nevertheless in business because becoming stockholders with those who do all of the things that are permitted under this bill.

The loan provisions of the bill are rather naïve. Indeed, under "Loans," on page 12, we find that—

Whenever the board finds \* \* \* that there is or may be a seasonal or year's total surplus in excess of the requirements for the orderly marketing of the commodity or beyond the domestic requirements for the commodity, then the board may make loans to the stabilization corporation for the commodity for buying and storing the surplus of the commodity.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] was entirely correct when he asserted that this was a provision, as I recall what he said in that regard, for the purchase in the market of the surplus of the crops that might have surpluses at the end of the year.

Not less than 75 per cent of all profits derived by a stabilization corporation each year from its surplus-control operations shall be paid into a surplus-control reserve fund to be established by the corporation. \* \* \* The corporation may distribute out of the remainder of the profits a patronage dividend.

In the Senate we have a peculiar definition for the word "patronage," but it is not perhaps the definition that might be applied in this measure. But observe the provision concerning losses:

All losses of the corporation from its surplus-control operations shall be paid from the surplus-control reserve fund or, if such fund is inadequate, they shall be paid by the board as a loan from the revolving fund.

Gather that now. The board from the revolving fund, where it is essential, shall pay such sums as may be necessary to cover the losses from the operations of the stabilization corporation.

The bill proceeds:

Any amounts so loaned shall be repaid into the revolving fund by the corporation from future profits from its surplus-controlled operation.

Just think of it! Any amounts so loaned shall be repaid into the revolving fund by the corporation from future profits. That is all. When the losses have been made up out of the fund the Congress shall appropriate, then those losses shall be repaid the Government out of the profits that may be made hereafter! What a glorious provision of the bill that is! How any one of us would like to enter into a business enterprise in connection with which it is agreed that all losses will be paid by the Government of the United States and then we promise to pay those losses at some dim, distant day in the future out of the profits we may subsequently make in the same kind of business. That is this bill.

Talk of the Government in business! Say that you will not permit a bounty under a debenture plan that is definite, fixed, and certain; say that you will not permit your Government to give a bonus because it is a dreadful thing for the Government to interfere with private initiative and to do what may be done by private enterprise; out upon that kind of socialistic heresy, say our brethren here in this Chamber; and then they not only sponsor but they fight here for a bill which they say is an administration measure by which the Government is going to pay all the losses of business first, and then take a Micawber promissory note for the repayment of the losses at some time in the future out of the profits that may be made from the operation of the law; and to make that increasingly plain, we provide in the next sentence—

Stockholders or members of the corporation—

Just listen to this, ye who would not under any circumstances permit this Government to go into business or permit a bounty under any circumstances to be paid to a languishing agricultural industry, just mark this:

Stockholders or members of the corporation shall not be subject to assessment for any losses incurred in the surplus control operations of the corporation.

A delightful, charming, and naïve provision! It would, of course, delight any business on the face of the earth, and, if it is meant to be carried out, it might be of great value to the farming industry of this country; but if it be true, as is asserted, that the Government must never be taken into business; if it be so, as has been proclaimed from the housetops

in the last few months, that under no circumstances shall we ever permit a subsidy or a bounty to be given to any people in this land, no matter how they may suffer; if it be the policy of the Government in the future, as it has been in the last few years, that never shall either misfortune, catastrophe, or devastation require this Government to put its hand to a business proposition in order to aid those who may be unfortunate enough to be caught in the cataclysm; if that be the policy of the Government in the days to come, then the plain provisions of this proposed loan can not be carried out; and it is an utter and absolute impossibility that full significance shall be given to it in the days to come. It is because of that very uncertainty, because I realize the preaching that has been put over on this Government and in this land, because I understand something of this conspiracy of press, pulpit, and politicians to work upon the psychology of America, it is because I fear that the real import of this bill may not be accorded unto the farmers, that I accept the debenture plan, the one definite, unequivocal, and unambiguous provision in the bill, which will permit the farmers to have a part of the tariff protection. There is the one place in the bill where there is no room for construction; there is the one place in the measure where relief can not be denied. Call it a bounty and say that a bounty is such a wicked thing that it never shall be extended to a people for their relief, and then you write into a bill—by language, at least—a bounty infinitely greater in extent and infinitely more far-reaching than the bounty it is suggested would come from the debenture plan, and this exactly is done under the bill as it has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Follow me further as I read from the bill on page 14:

(c) The board may make loans to any cooperative association and/or to any stabilization corporation for the purpose of developing continuity of cooperative services from the point of production to and including the point of terminal marketing service, if the proceeds of the loan are to be used for assisting the cooperative association or corporation in acquisition—

Oh, what a terrible word that is—"acquisition"! To acquire with the public money something that private initiative might be able to provide and out of which it might be able to reap some profit. During the last few years and to-day it has been a cardinal principle of those in control never to permit the Government, no matter what the necessity, no matter what the extremity, to do that which some private individual or private enterprise could do and make money out of. We have been advised that that never should be tolerated, but in this bill Senators who hold that view propose to provide that—

\* \* \* if the proceeds of the loan are to be used for assisting the cooperative association or corporation in acquisition by purchase, construction, or otherwise—

"Or otherwise"—

of facilities and equipment for the preparing, handling, storing, processing, or sale or other disposition of agricultural commodities.

The whole question is, Do you mean it or do you not? If you mean it, kiss good-by to the old platitude of not taking the Government into business; kiss good-by forever the old dogma that has been advanced here day after day and year after year that we should never permit the Government to do anything for its people that private initiative or private endeavor may do and make a profit out of.

I again quote from the bill on page 15:

The board may make loans to cooperative associations for working capital, and loans to such associations and to agricultural purchasing associations for the cooperative purchasing of supplies and equipment for use in the production of agricultural commodities by their members.

And then in paragraph (d) on page 15 it is provided:

The board may make loans to any cooperative association for the purpose of enabling the association—

To do what?—

to advance to its members a greater share of the market price of the commodity delivered to the association than is practicable under other credit facilities.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORBECK. In other words, to extend more credit than the banker considers it safe to extend.

Mr. JOHNSON. Exactly; and if the money is lost the Government is going to be paid out of future profits; do not forget that.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GLENN. Is that plan comparable to that in the Boulder Dam bill under which the Government is to be repaid out of future profits?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; it is not comparable to that particular plan. Of course, the Senator from Illinois would be exercised by that plan. I recognize that, and I do not blame him. His philosophy and mine are quite different. The Boulder Dam act seeks to safeguard people in the West who require to be protected from devastation by flood. They are only people; that is all; just men and women and little children who require governmental aid. It is a shame and disgrace that that aid should be accorded those children and those women and those men, when Mr. Insull, or some power magnate, might be able to make a profit out of the Boulder Dam. That is a terrible thing for us to do out there with the Boulder Dam; it is a shameful waste to divert government merely to humanity, merely to save life and prevent flood, when some great power magnate might make money out of that situation and out of that great dam. It is a sad thing, it is true. We differ and I quarrel with nobody in his differences with me in philosophy of this sort. One man has one view and one another, and we can not all agree, of course; but what I am trying to do is to call attention to what this bill pretends to provide.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GLENN. I do not think my interests are any more in common with those of Mr. Insull than are the interests of the distinguished Senator from California. I was merely calling attention to the extreme ridicule which the Senator is visiting upon this proposal which provides that the Government shall be reimbursed out of future profits, as compared with the extreme enthusiasm which the Senator exhibited in connection with a like provision in the Boulder Dam bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I quite understood the Senator from Illinois, and I endeavored adequately to answer him.

The crowning infamy from the standpoint of some of my colleagues that occurs in this bill is in another direction. Do Senators realize where we go in taking the United States into business in the fashion that I have indicated? We go far, far beyond that when we take the Nation into the insurance business. Do Senators realize that or have they not read the bill with sufficient comprehension to understand it? In paragraph (e), on page 16, it is provided:

The board may make advances from the revolving fund to meet obligations under any insurance agreement, as hereinafter authorized.

Then under the insurance section—

The board is authorized, upon application of cooperative associations, to enter into agreements, subject to the conditions hereinafter specified, for the insurance of the cooperative associations—

Against what? What is the kind of insurance business into which it is proposed the Government of the United States shall enter? Fire, life, ordinary insurance, about which sometimes we have heard and with which we are more or less familiar? Not a bit of it. The Government is to go into the insurance business to insure "against loss through price decline." The Government engaging in business as against private initiative! We will hear so much of it in the future that I am calling attention to it in the present.

Sir, I have not the time at my disposition to do what I should like to do with this bill. Unfortunately, of course, in the closing arguments upon a proposition of this sort we must hasten in a fashion that we do not like. I call your attention as well to section 9, dealing with the clearing-house association. I assert and reassert that there is not a single, solitary kind of business that the wit of man can yet conceive that could be entered into in relation to an agricultural commodity that under this bill the Government will not enter into with its money, at least, and under which the Government may not do exactly as it sees fit in respect to any such business.

I iterate and reiterate that fact; but I say, of course, that the generic provisions of the bill may be tortured, some time in the future, in a fashion that would take from the Government the real right that might be accorded it under the bill, and would prevent the beneficent purpose in the Government going into these various businesses in behalf of a stricken industry.

I repeat to you, sir, in closing, because I want to leave some time for others who are interested in this bill, though I have not

in any degree touched the subject as I would desire—I repeat, sir, to you, there is one plain, unequivocal, and unambiguous provision in this bill, the debenture clause. It touches upon the raw some of our sensitive brethren, because it touches the tariff; but I recall to them that our promise to the people of the United States was that at this session we would put agriculture upon an equality with industry. There is not anything in this bill that puts agriculture upon an equality with industry except the debenture clause. For that reason I am for that clause, in redemption of a promise that every one of us upon this floor has made to his constituents.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	La Follette	Smith
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Smoot
Barkley	Gillett	McMaster	Steck
Bingham	Glass	McNary	Stetler
Black	Glenn	Metcalf	Stephens
Blaine	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Blease	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Greene	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Burton	Harrison	Patterson	Tyson
Capper	Hastings	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Edge	Kean	Sheppard	
Fess	Keyes	Shortridge	
Fletcher	King	Simmons	

Mr. SCHALL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is in the hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, what I shall have to say will relate entirely to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to strike the debenture provision from the farm bill. Incidentally only, I desire to state that the bill reported to the House and passed by the House, which is substantially the same as the Senate bill, aside from the debenture plan incorporated in it, will, in my opinion, accomplish something. It has at least sufficient merit, as I believe, not only to justify but to command my vote.

I wish to emphasize that for the purpose of saying what I am now about to say, and that is that the possible increased price to the farmer from the debenture plan will easily be absorbed if the farm board functions as it is hoped that it will function, and if that board, through its operations, succeeds in reducing even appreciably the price spread between the producer and the ultimate consumer.

Let me illustrate what I am trying to say:

The President has pointed out that the passage of the bill with the debenture plan in it would result in higher prices at home and would aggravate the unequal competition between American manufacturers and manufacturers abroad and agriculturists in America and agriculturists abroad. I desire to read a statement issued by the Grange, for a long time an advocate of the debenture plan; and I wish to read this statement upon this particular phase of the question—increased cost in the domestic market:

Food costs need not be increased to any appreciable extent and in many instances not at all. The price paid by the consumer bears so little direct relation to the price received by the farmer that the increase in the wholesale price might be entirely offset by more efficient distribution.

The whole scheme of the bill is to provide a farm board that will make possible a more efficient distribution. If it is worth anything at all to the American farmer it will relieve the consumer of the increase the producer will gain by the debenture plan.

But to continue:

For instance, the wheat in the average 8.55-cent loaf of bread costs only 1.15 cents, according to a recent report of the Federal Trade Commission. Allowing the proposed 21-cent increase in the price of a bushel of wheat under the export debenture plan, this would amount to



only about 0.15 part of a cent increase in the cost of the wheat required in the loaf of bread.

Or, Mr. President, about 0.15 of 1 cent.

Since the margin between the baker and the consumer is about 6.5 cents, this added small fraction of a cent in cost could readily be covered through better efficiency in distribution and cause no increase in the retail price of bread.

I repeat, if the farm board to be set up under this bill functions at all, if it succeeds in reducing the spread in the price between the farmer and the ultimate consumer by even a shade, it will absorb the possible increase in the price in the domestic market that will result to the farmer by virtue of the operation of the debenture plan.

When the President insists that the domestic prices of food products and of raw farm products will be advanced to the detriment of the American farmer, the American business man, the American consumer, and the American manufacturer he at once condemns the only bill that he indorses. In effect he says that this farm board, with its \$500,000,000 revolving fund, is going to be so weak, so impotent, to influence prices of farm products, as not to absorb the fifteen-hundredth part of 1 per cent of the cost in a loaf of bread if the debenture plan should be put into operation, and if the debenture plan should actually result in the raising of the price of wheat to full 21 cents a bushel, as it is hoped by those who believe in the plan.

Mr. President, the President again—and it has been often repeated in this body—has asserted that if this debenture plan is retained in the bill foreign countries will be incited to pass retaliatory measures against us. It has not been shown, it can not be shown, that any foreign nation would be any more incited by the passage of the debenture legislation proposed here than by the passage of the protective tariff bill that was presented in the House yesterday. But it is said, and said by the President, and repeated here, that if there should be a rise in the price of farm products resulting from the enactment of the debenture plan into law the farmer would be thereby encouraged to overproduction.

Mr. President, it has been shown in this body, not once but many times, that during periods of depression the farmers have invariably exerted themselves to the utmost in order to absorb their losses, or to overcome their handicaps through increased production. It is absolutely certain, I think, that an increase in the average price of cotton, for instance, over the last 5-year period, of 2 cents per pound, or \$10 a bale, would not be sufficient to attract new capital into the production of cotton. Those who are now engaged in producing cotton are producing to the utmost anyway, they have been attempting, and yet are attempting, to overcome their losses by increased production, and they can not produce more, say what we will about it, until they find themselves in an improved economic condition that will enable them to make more. So the only production likely to flow from the incorporation of the debenture plan in this bill, the only stimulant that will be administered, must come finally from the improved economic condition of the farmer himself.

Is his improved condition going to result in overproduction on his part? To assert so is to assert that the American farmer has not judgment enough to use a good law enacted for his benefit; that he can always be relied upon to abuse any law that actually benefits him.

Mr. President, it has been said before in this body, and I repeat it merely for the sake of emphasis, that if this plan, resulting, as we hope, in an increase in the price of the farmer's products, will stimulate production, then anything that will help the farmer will result in the same overproduction. But let me make it even stronger if I can. The only thing that is attempted in the bill passed by the House and approved by the President is to get for the farmer a better price for his product. That is to say, this is a marketing bill, and a marketing bill simply. If it succeeds as a marketing bill, all good and well. I think that it has sufficient merit at least to justify our support, but if it does succeed it will result in the same overproduction on the part of the farmer.

Mr. President, there is but one way that the Congress will be able to give to the farmer higher prices for his products through improved marketing methods and facilities without stimulating production, if the objection urged is sound. There is but one possible practical way to control or regulate his production. There may be some method under the Constitution by which production may be regulated and controlled other than the one to which I am about to refer, but even if that is true, the farmer will not permit the trying out of such plan or program for a sufficient length of time to demonstrate its utility.

The only way to control production which the American voter will indorse, or will permit to continue, is to control production through the financing of the farmer's production. It never can be done by financing the marketing of his products, and there is not now proposed and was not proposed by the last administration anything but a marketing bill.

It is absolutely impossible to devise any marketing bill, in my judgment, under the limitations of the Constitution, that will help the farmer which will not at the same time open that measure to the objection lodged against the debenture plan, to wit, that it will stimulate the production of the farmer.

I think the time may come in this country—indeed, I can foresee the time—when we will undertake to control production, but we will undertake to control it through the financing of production. In no other way will it be done, in view of the fact that the American farmer himself will assert himself at the ballot box.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], though he has proposed what may appeal to most of us as an extravagant measure, has put his hand upon this question of the control and regulation of production, because he foresees that you can not do it except through the financing of production.

So, as long as you deal with the marketing of the farmers' products, as long as the administration confines us to marketing bills, as long as we are restricted to marketing programs, we can not possibly devise a scheme that will not encourage the farmers to produce more crops, if the scheme works, admitting the validity of the argument.

I want to repeat, on the basis of the figures I have cited here, if the present marketing scheme works, it will absorb without additional cost to the consumer every cent of increase that will accrue to the wheat grower by virtue of the operation of the debenture plan, or that will accrue to the cotton grower, or to the grower of any other farm product. If the marketing plan will not absorb that small increase possible to the American farmer, then the marketing plan is not worth trying; and when I say absorb it, I mean through the reduction of the tremendous spread between the price received by the producer and the price now paid by the consumer.

Mr. President, a better view of the question is expressed by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, when he uses this language:

We realize, however, that any legislation that might be enacted and might be helpful would, of course, have a tendency to raise the price level, because that has been the ultimate objective. We believe that ought to be done, notwithstanding the fact that perhaps the cost that would follow the raise of the price level would fall somewhat upon the great consuming mass of labor.

We think that it is really an economic crime that such a large number of people in our great country should be producing a commodity below the actual cost of production, and we are conscious of the fact that that is going on and that the farmers are suffering very greatly. We believe that it is a menace to the welfare of working men and women, and to a continuation of our national prosperity and well-being.

Mr. President, without the slightest hesitation, I say that there is more statesmanship in that utterance, in that sentiment, in the position taken by Mr. Green, than there is in any utterance that has been made by the President of the United States in his assault upon this bill. Can anybody dispute the soundness of the proposition expressed by Mr. Green?

Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the protective system, the author of the protective policy in this country, did not dispute it, because he said, when he proposed to give to the manufacturers the protective tariff, that it was needful to give to the producers of raw material some sort of bounty. That, I confess, is what this is.

Mr. President, permit me to digress, not because the substance of what I wish here to insert is not already in the Record but because the case is better stated than I have seen it elsewhere stated. I am about to read from the Progressive Farmer, a constructive farm newspaper. Bear in mind that this statement is undertaking to emphasize, not the disadvantages and handicaps of agriculture under existing conditions but the natural and fundamental handicaps on agricultural production. I quote:

The farmer can not predetermine or control production. When the cotton farmer, for instance, plants his crop in the spring he does not know whether he is to harvest 6 bales or 10 from a given acreage. The manufacturer can predetermine his production to a single unit.

Because the farmer can not predetermine his production he can not know its cost per unit and can not budget his expenses.

The farmer can not know at what price his products will be sold, because a large crop and a small temporary surplus often reduces the price out of all proportion to its cost or the size of the surplus.

Because of the long turnover—from one to three or more years—the farmer can not speed up production after his crops are planted, no matter how good economic conditions become or prospective prices promise.

After the farmer plants his crops he can not slow down his operations, no matter how bad economic conditions look, without starvation and ruin.

The final statement made in this analysis is:

Because of their bulky nature and their low unit value, because many farm products are perishable, and because the volume of production by the individual farmer is so small, there are natural handicaps on the efficient marketing of farm products which do not apply to most other products.

The body of the bill, that is the portion of the bill creating the farm board and making an appropriation or authorizing an appropriation of \$500,000,000 for the purpose of marketing the farmer's product, would seek to remedy the natural handicaps or would seek to overcome them, as set forth in the last paragraph quoted from the Farm Journal; but every other fundamental handicap of the farmer will remain virtually unaffected by the marketing provisions of the bill even if we grant that the bill will operate to the advantage of the farmer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will suspend while the clerk reads the unanimous-consent agreement, which goes into effect at this hour.

The Chief Clerk read the unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

*Ordered*, by unanimous consent, That after 2 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 8, 1929, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes upon the pending amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to strike out section 10, as amended, relating to the debenture plan.

Mr. GEORGE. Coming directly to the debenture plan, it is said, and it must be said by all who support the bill on either side of the aisle, that we can risk the farm board created by the bill to exercise perhaps the most far-reaching powers ever given to any agency. We must risk the board, we must rely upon it whether we are altogether satisfied to do so. That being true, why can not we rely upon the board to withhold the debenture plan—that is, to refuse to put the debenture plan in operation—unless conditions actually demand it? The plan is optional. The board is not required to put it in operation. The board is merely authorized to put it in operation. If the protection given farm products in the schedules carried in the tariff bill introduced in the House yesterday are 50 per cent effective, the farm board, if it has ordinary common sense, will not put the debenture plan in operation. Why? Because all that is proposed under the debenture plan is to give the American farmer one-half of the benefit of the American protective tariff. The administration has written the bill and as it has been introduced in the House it increases duties on farm products coming into the country. A board of boys 15 years old would not put the debenture plan in operation if the tariff proved to be 50 per cent effective during the next four years.

What is to be said in answer to the proposition? What is to be said on the other side of the aisle? It is proposed to make the tariff only 50 per cent effective. It is proposed to issue debentures equal to only 50 per cent of the tariff fixed at the special session of the Congress. The board, of course, charged with the responsibility of functioning as the bill requires them to function, will not put the debenture plan in operation if the tariff on agricultural products becomes 50 per cent effective.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. In other words, to vote against the debenture plan is to declare that we know the tariff, although written in the bill, is not to be effective.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly so, and they very certainly know it will not be effective.

Mr. CARAWAY. But is only for the purpose of fooling the farmer.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

For the reasons emphasized on this floor time after time, generally the tariff on agricultural products is not effective. There are some few exceptions or qualifications to the general statement. For instance, in the tariff bill there is an increase in duty on many farm products, but let no American farmer be deceived into believing that he is going to get any increase in the price on that account. There has been no effort to ex-

clude exchangeable farm products, but there has been given the farmer in the bill introduced in the House yesterday additional paper tariffs for his edification and delight. It will make wonderfully interesting reading to the farmer in the cold winter nights of 1929, but it will not result in raising his price a single cent. Where the farmer has been given an increase in his duties exchangeable products and in many instances directly competitive products have been allowed to come in duty free. For the most part the bill gives the farmers higher paper rates.

But that is not all. In the first message delivered by President Hoover to the Congress he used some very significant language, significant in the light of the provisions of the present tariff bill. He said:

I am impressed with the fact that we also need important revision in some of the administrative phases of the tariff. The Tariff Commission should be reorganized and placed upon a basis of higher salaries in order that we may at all times command men of the broadest attainments.

So far so good. The bill introduced in the House yesterday proposes to increase the Tariff Commission by one, and does in fact increase the salaries of the members of the commission. Let me read further from the President's message:

However, the basis upon which the Tariff Commission makes its recommendations to the President for administrative changes in the rates of duties should be made more automatic and more comprehensive, to the end that the time required for determinations by the Tariff Commission shall be greatly shortened.

The President next said:

Considerable weaknesses on the administrative side of the tariff have developed, especially in the valuations for assessments of duty.

Then he said:

I believe it is desirable to furnish to the Treasury a sounder basis for valuation.

Not only has the Tariff Commission been increased, not only have the salaries of its members been increased by the terms of the bill introduced in the House yesterday, but the bipartisan character of that commission has been utterly destroyed, and now it is but a tool in the hands of the Executive under the terms of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The bill has been construed in line with his statement by many students of it as an abdication by the Congress of the power to enact tariff legislation and as an attempt to vest almost the entire legislative power in the Executive. His right to reorganize the commission without limitation, his power to determine whether the duty shall be based on foreign or American valuation, and his power upon recommendation of the commission to raise or lower the rates 50 per cent give to the Executive control of the whole subject.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly, Mr. President. The bill introduced in the House yesterday also is based on the theory that the cost of production alone does not accurately reflect competitive conditions and that equalizing the costs of production would not be sufficient to avoid damaging competition to the country's industries; that therefore provision is made in the House bill for the equalization of "conditions of competition in the principal market or markets of the United States between domestic articles and like or similar competitive and imported articles." That is the language of the bill.

Bear in mind, the President of the United States, upon the recommendation of the commission which he now may appoint without regard to the political affiliations of any member of the board, which he may fill with members holding the view that he holds—the view of the high protectionist—may raise, or lower of course, the duties in the tariff act by 50 per cent. But that is not all. That is not even the serious objection to this bill.

The basis of valuation has been changed, and now the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to find, under the provisions of the House bill, that neither the foreign value nor the export value can be definitely ascertained, and the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury is final upon the question. The American value will, of course, be applied wherever it is advantageous to the protected interests. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas not only is the bill, in view of the flexible provisions thereof and the valuation clause now incorporated therein, an abdication by the Congress of its powers to legislate but it will not be necessary for any seeker of special privilege to come to Congress again for legislation.



Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. He can probably accomplish his desired end by going to some clerk, messenger, or agent who will make the actual study and report to the Tariff Commission, who will, in turn, make recommendation to the President.

Mr. GEORGE. Not only that, but he will insist, of course, upon the American value in every instance where that is to his advantage, and he will get his final decision in the Treasury Department, in the executive department, so that practically, under the provisions of the bill, the power to write the tariff is taken out of the hands of the legislative body and placed in the executive department of the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The change in valuation works a practical change in rates.

Mr. GEORGE. It may and undoubtedly will do so.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The subject which the Senator is discussing is interesting, and it is particularly so because in my judgment the remedy lies with the Congress; that is to say, the Supreme Court of the United States has rendered an opinion which would permit the Congress to delegate our power entire to the President if we were subservient enough to do it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on an amendment repealing the entire flexible provision in the tariff act as vested in the Executive.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GEORGE. I would be delighted to yield, but I have only five minutes left.

Mr. DILL. I just wanted to make the suggestion that with the passage of a few bills like this the President will never need to tell Congress what he wants us to do in the matter of legislation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, within the five minutes remaining to me, let me say that it is acknowledged on all sides, it has never been denied in any quarter, that the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act imposed the highest rates of duty ever placed upon the American consumer. Almost negligible are the reductions proposed by the pending House bill and only a few minor items have been transferred to the free list. To the extent that the House bill has dealt with schedules rates have been raised. They have given the farmer paper schedules, but they have revamped the flexible provision of the tariff act; they have made the Tariff Commission an agency completely under the domination and control of the Executive. They have given to the Executive, through one of his subordinate officers, the right to fix any value that will be beneficial to the products of industry already protected by the existing high schedules. Under the flexible provision of the tariff act and under the valuation clause it will be quite possible in some instances for the President of the United States, without the intervention of Congress, to raise existing tariff rates approximately 100 per cent. That is a condition that will arise as certainly as the pending tariff bill shall become a law, and that it will become law we must assume, because surely there was a referendum on that subject if there was a referendum on the farm relief proposal.

So we come, Mr. President, to this: If our Republican friends are in earnest when they say they want to give to the American farmer the benefit of the tariff, in view of the provisions which have been written in the pending tariff bill, and in view of the fact that the debenture plan will not be put in operation if the tariff shall operate so as to give the farmer one-half of the rates that are written in the bill, where is the logic or the consistency in voting against the debenture plan?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will not the farmer need such a plan even more after the new tariff bill shall become effective than he needs it now?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that is what I am trying to show. Under the proposed law the protected interests will not have to come to Congress; that they will not have to log-roll any more; that they will not have to maintain any lobbies any longer. All they will have to do is to call on the Executive and say, "Mr. President, the commission, which is called the Tariff

Commission, is your creature; it reflects your views upon the tariff; have it recommend a 50 per cent increase and give it to us." Then they will call on the President again and say, "Mr. President, your executive officer, the Secretary of the Treasury"—or an appraiser in his office, drawing \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year—"has a right finally to fix the value of any article imported into this country and give us the benefit of a valuation that will inure most to our benefit as the special beneficiaries and pets of the protective system." The Executive will have it in his power—as I have said, and I think it can be demonstrated—to raise the tariff upon many of the already highly protected articles produced in this country not by 50 per cent but by well nigh 100 per cent. There will not be any further use for the Congress. All the protected interests in this country will have to do will be to marshal and mobilize their forces back of the law as written, and it will be a long day before the American Congress will be able to repeal this measure once it is crystallized into law. Fortified by the law the protected interests of this country will fight their political battles to retain it. In face of this tariff proposal, can not the farm board which it is proposed to create and which we are assured will be composed of men of intelligence and of character, with a disposition to serve agriculture, be given the saving power contained in the debenture plan? What answer can our Republican friends make?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TYSON. Mr. President, I desire to perfect the amendment which I have offered to the pending bill by putting into it, in pursuance of a suggestion made by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], certain language, as follows:

In the proposed amendment on page 1, at the end of lines 3, 6, and 9, and on page 2, at the end of lines 3 and 6, insert the words "if the cotton or tobacco out of which it is manufactured, if exported in the raw material, would have been entitled to receive a debenture therefor."

Mr. President, if no further discussion of the question be desired, I should be glad to have a vote upon my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON], as modified, to insert in the language proposed to be stricken out by the Senator from Indiana a provision relating to products manufactured from cotton and tobacco.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may the amendment, as modified, be read for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 24, after the word "thereof," it is proposed to insert the words "or any product manufactured from cotton or tobacco, if the cotton or tobacco out of which it is manufactured, if exported in the raw material, would have been entitled to receive a debenture therefor."

Also the same amendment on page 19, line 15, after the word "product"; on page 19, line 17, after the word "product"; on page 20, line 10, after the word "commodity"; and on page 20, line 14, after the word "product."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry state his position as to the amendment which has just been offered?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the amendment was not discussed in the committee. I assume from hearing it read that it applies to textiles made out of cotton and to products manufactured from tobacco and proposes to make such textiles and tobacco products debenturable the same as the raw material. Of course, I am opposed to the debenture. I doubt if there is to be found a tremendous amount of wisdom in the proposal, but that is for the Senate to decide.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee puts textiles and articles manufactured from tobacco on the same basis upon which other agricultural products are placed under the bill. The objection was raised to the bill that the raw material might be bought abroad cheaper than in this country, and therefore an advantage would be given to the foreign manufacturer. The amendment provides that the home manufacturer who may buy the raw materials at a price enhanced by the amount of the debenture, when he exports the articles manufactured by him, may get back the excess price which he paid for his raw material because of the debenture. That is all the amendment provides. It puts the domestic manufacturer on a parity with the foreign manufacturer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON].

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, so far as I am informed, all Senators who desire to speak upon the pending motion have spoken. Therefore, as we are approaching the hour of voting, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	La Follette	Smith
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Smoot
Barkley	Gillett	McMaster	Steak
Bingham	Glass	McNary	Steiger
Black	Glenn	Metcalf	Stephens
Blaine	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Blease	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Greene	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Burton	Harrison	Patterson	Tyson
Capper	Hastings	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Randsell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Edge	Kean	Sheppard	
Fess	Keyes	Shortridge	
Fletcher	King	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I have here a resolution from the farm bureau of my State and a telegram from the Northwestern Agricultural Association that I should like to have read into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The executive board of the Minnesota Farm Bureau, in session on April 30, passed the following resolution:

"We unqualifiedly condemn the House bill now pending before Congress. As we interpret it, we can not see that the farmers of America will be helped in the least by its enactment. The provisions of the bill would not allow a friendly agricultural board to do anything that would increase the price on surplus farm commodities, and should the bill be administered by a board not entirely friendly to agriculture, we can see where great harm might be done to agriculture, particularly to our cooperative organizations.

"The Senate bill contains some helpful features, but even that should be amended, as suggested by the leaders of the dairymen's associations and other friends of agriculture, or the legislation may prove of greater benefit to the opponents of cooperatives than to the real successful, experienced producer-controlled and producer-operated organizations.

"These bills as now drawn would permit a clearing-house association to be made up of private distributing concerns and fake cooperatives who would be entitled to loans in the same way that the genuine cooperatives are entitled to.

"Under provisions of the bill almost any sort of a purchasing agency could be framed up so that it would qualify under this legislation.

"We can not discover any feature in the bill, if it were administered by the farmers themselves, that would make the tariff duties effective on any farm crop produced in surplus. The loan feature sounds big, but if taken advantage of by cooperatives under provision of the House bill may prove the death knell of the cooperative accepting the loan, and if to be effective and properly administered is not adequate to meet the needs.

"We are greatly disturbed by the fact that Congress has permitted the grain trade, speculators in food products, and manipulators of farm prices to shape every sentence of the bill proposed. Farmers' views have been disregarded in shaping this legislation, and if the bill is administered by men selected from the group that has had a hand and been so solicitous in shaping the legislation, we have great fears that the legislation unless greatly amended will prove to be another menace to agriculture. Agriculture can expect nothing from those who have manipulated our markets in the past. Agriculture was promised in the last campaign legislation that would place the farmer on an equal basis with industry, finance, and transportation. We see nothing in the proposed bills that will make good these promises. It is further depressing to know that practically all men who have been suggested to serve on the farm board are men who have been opposed and fought cooperative farm organizations in the past, who have opposed to the last ditch every form of legislation that might be beneficial to agriculture, or men who would be pawns in the hands of men who are avowed enemies of agriculture.

"We believe that any appointment to membership on the Federal farm board of persons who have been engaged in the sale or handling of farm products in opposition to cooperative organizations would be fatal."

UNITED STATES SENATE,

(Care of Senator Thomas D. Schall,

Senator of State of Minnesota),

Washington, D. C.:

We are privileged by the Constitution of the United States to convey and state to your honorable body that we earnestly desire and advocate an agricultural bill that shall contain the debenture plan as a part of agricultural legislation.

It is our firm conviction and belief that the debenture plan will materially benefit the American farmer and effectually operate to his advantage.

The debenture plan will narrow the disparity now existing between agriculture and industry, and assist in placing agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries.

We are convinced that had this plan been in operation during the last eight years the whole agricultural region, and particularly the Northwest, would have escaped one of the most serious financial and agricultural depressions in its history.

We believe that the debenture plan is now the only feasible solution, and that it should be indorsed as part of the legislation in behalf of agricultural industry.

NORTHWESTERN AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,

CHARLES P. KLEINMANN,

President, 600 Lincoln Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution and the telegram will lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to have the clerk read the letter from the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,

May 8, 1929.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As you know, I have been obliged to absent myself from my senatorial duties owing to illness; and I am now confined at the Johns Hopkins Hospital.

Scarcely any question has arisen since I have been a Member of the Senate on which I am more anxious to record my vote, which I believe represents the sentiments of the State of Minnesota, than that in favor of the debenture plan of farm relief.

I shall appreciate your pairing with me upon this question, as I understand you are as strongly opposed as I am in favor of the debenture plan.

My doctors state it is absolutely impossible for me to take the risk of going to the Senate at this time; and, of course, on a measure of this importance you will realize that every constituency has a right to have its vote recorded. I shall appreciate your pairing with me on this measure, and relieving me of the necessity of taking the risk of further impairing my health by leaving the hospital at this time, or of failure to have the views of my constituency recorded on this measure.

With most cordial personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, as we are approaching a vote on this matter, it seems to me that it might be useful, as a matter of record, to take three or four minutes to summarize and review the position taken by the President of the United States in his letter to the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], in regard to the weaknesses of the plan called the debenture plan; and I ask leave to refer to those for a few minutes. I shall not read it all but shall try to summarize eight or nine of the points which he mentions.

Mr. Hoover says in his letter:

The weaknesses of the plan as set forth in the Senate bill may be summarized as follows.

In the first place, he calls attention to the fact that the issue of debentures to export merchants, and their redemption in payment of import duties, amounts to a direct subsidy from the United States Treasury. He states that if the plan proposed were generally applied it would cost more than \$200,000,000 a year, since it would decrease the Treasury receipts by that amount.

In the second place, he states that the first result of the plan, if put into operation, would be a gigantic gift from the Government and the public to the dealers, manufacturers, and speculators in these commodities.



In the third place, he states that "if the increased price did reflect to the farmer," the plan would stimulate overproduction, increase the world supply, and decrease the price which the farmer would receive.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BINGHAM. I decline to yield until I have finished the statement. Then I shall be glad to yield to my friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. In the fourth place, the President states that the stimulation of production of certain commodities would disturb the whole basis of diversification in American agriculture.

In the fifth place, he states that, although it is proposed that the plan should only be installed at the discretion of the farm board, the well-known tendency of all boards and commissions set up by the Government to use the whole of their power and the tremendous pressure that would be brought to bear on them would make it likely that the plan would be put into operation.

In the sixth place, he states that it is not proposed to pay the debentures to the farmers, but to the export merchants, and "it seems certain that a large part of the subsidy would not be reflected back to the farmer."

In the seventh place, he states that the provision of such an export subsidy would necessitate a revision of the import tariffs.

In the eighth place, he states that export bounties are recognized by many nations as one form of dumping and that a similar action by another nation would be construed as a violation of our own laws. Such laws are in force in the principal countries of our export markets, and to protect their own agriculture would probably lead to action which would nullify this subsidy.

In the ninth place, he calls attention to the serious question which has arisen as to the result of enabling the foreign raiser and producer of animals to purchase feed for those animals at less than the American farmer can do who desires to purchase feed to produce such animals. He calls attention to the fact that the swine growers in Ontario would probably be able to purchase American corn for less than the American farmers across the border engaged in the same business.

Finally, Mr. President, President Hoover calls attention to the fact that the plan would require a substantial increase in taxes, as no such expenditure as this plan implies could be paid from marginal income of the Government, more particularly in view of the very large increased expenditures imposed by the naval program, flood control, as well as other branches of farm relief.

It seems appropriate at this time to point out the 10 reasons which President Hoover gives in his message to the chairman of the committee for his objection to the debenture plan. I have brought this to the attention of the Senate because several times there has arisen, in conversations with Senators on the floor and in the cloakrooms, some doubt as to whether the President actually was very strongly opposed to the plan; and it seemed appropriate that these reasons should be made a part of the Record at this time.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I merely want to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that that letter was published in the newspapers and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10 days ago. I am sorry the Senator never saw it until this afternoon. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] just a question or two. I presume he shares the views that he read, as expressed by the President?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to say that I do, Mr. President, most heartily.

Mr. NORBECK. Does the Senator feel that the farmer should not have the benefit of the tariff?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is a question to which the answer is so obvious that I hardly need tell the Senator that I agree entirely with the platform of the Republican Party that the farmer is entitled to the protective tariff on his products just as much as the manufacturer is so entitled; and, so far as I am able to do so, I propose to vote, when the tariff bill comes before us, for duties on farm products which will protect the farmer adequately.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator is aware of the fact that the Tariff Commission found that the difference in the cost of production of wheat here and abroad was 42 cents a bushel and that the present duty is 42 cents a bushel. It is also 42 cents a bushel in the bill proposed in the House. The Senator would like to see that duty effective, would he?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I shall be glad to vote for any tariff on any farm product that will do for that farm product what the tariff on manufactured products does for the

manufacturer; but may I say to the Senator, before concluding my answer, that no tariff that can be placed on the articles manufactured in the State of Connecticut, if there is a surplus of such articles, will help the price of that surplus in the slightest degree.

Mr. NORBECK. I think the point the Senator overlooks is this: The President has said, first, that the farmers will not get the benefit of this debenture of 21 cents; second, that if they do it will injure them. In other words, if they get the benefit of 50 per cent of the tariff it is a bad thing for the American farmer. That is the doctrine the Senator has read to us here.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from South Dakota and I interpret those words a little differently. If this were called a straight "subsidy" instead of a "debenture," it would be a little easier to discuss it. Yet that is exactly what it is; it is a subsidy; it is actually an export bounty. It is exactly as though we asked that the manufactured products of the State of Connecticut, which we are unable to dispose of in the United States, when similar products are shipped from abroad, might receive a bounty on each product.

Mr. NORBECK. My people in South Dakota are paying a bounty on goods manufactured in Connecticut right now, in the way of the tariff.

Referring to another matter, what did the Senator mean by "diversification" as he read it to the Senate?

Mr. BINGHAM. Exactly what President Hoover meant.

Mr. NORBECK. Does the Senator hold that if we produce less wheat and have an export surplus of something else it will help the farmer?

Mr. BINGHAM. That does not seem to be a relevant question.

Mr. NORBECK. The point in the matter is that this country's acreage is so large that we are bound to have an agricultural surplus, it does not make any difference much where it lies. In the whole debate on the floor nobody, not even the President, has suggested a method of balancing our production in this country, and I maintain that it does not make any difference whether we have a surplus of wheat or whether we stimulate our butter production to a point where we will have a surplus of butter. With no remedy to bring about equality the farm question can not be separated from the production of any domestic product.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I desire to say that so far as I know, with present methods of organization and manufacture in America and with our ability for mass production, there is no possible way whereby the surplus which our factories can turn out can all be disposed of in this country any more than there is in the matter to which the Senator has just referred, and yet there is no more reason for paying a bounty on agricultural products than for paying a bounty on manufactured products.

Mr. NORBECK. There is still this difference, that the manufacturer gets a domestic price for his products, he has an American standard of living, and most of the agricultural products are sold in competition with the cheap lands and cheap labor of the world. We are asked to bear a tax to support the manufacturers, but we are denied the benefit of equality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING (when his name was called). If I were permitted to vote upon this amendment, I should vote "yea." The junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is ill in the hospital. I have talked with him within the past few minutes and during the day, and he is disposed to come here and vote because of his interest in this matter. Because of the danger which might result if he should undertake to come here I have agreed to pair with him. Therefore I am compelled to withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. If I were free to vote, I would vote "yea," and he would vote "nay" if he were present and permitted to vote. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 44, nays 47, as follows:

## YEAS—44

Allen	Glenn	Keyes	Shortridge
Bingham	Goff	McNary	Smoot
Burton	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stelwer
Capper	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Couzens	Greene	Oddie	Townsend
Cutting	Hale	Patterson	Vandenberg
Dale	Hastings	Phipps	Wagner
Deneen	Hatfield	Ransdell	Walcott
Edge	Hebert	Reed	Warren
Fess	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Gillett	Kean	Sackett	Watson

## NAYS—47

Ashurst	Dill	La Follette	Simmons
Barkley	Fletcher	McKellar	Smith
Black	Frazier	McMaster	Steck
Blaine	George	Norbeck	Stephens
Blens	Glass	Norris	Swanson
Borah	Harris	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Harrison	Overman	Trammell
Brookhart	Hawes	Pine	Tydings
Broussard	Hayden	Pittman	Tyson
Caraway	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Howell	Schall	Wheeler
Copeland	Johnson	Sheppard	

## NOT VOTING—4

Kendrick	King	Shipstead	Walsh, Mass.
----------	------	-----------	--------------

So Mr. WATSON's motion to strike out section 10 as amended (the debenture plan) was rejected.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I expressed the hope a few days ago that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] would be able to press his amendment following the disposition of the motion which has just been voted upon by the Senate. Is the Senator in a position to do so to-day, or would he rather wait until to-morrow?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I will do exactly as the Senator desires and as may be the wish of the Senate. I will be glad to have my amendment reported, and then we can determine what to do with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, and immediately following subparagraph (d), insert a new subparagraph reading as follows:

(e) As used in this act, the words "agricultural commodity" mean an agricultural commodity which is not a fruit or a vegetable: *Provided, however*, That this subparagraph shall not apply to the provisions of section 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from New York a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask if he will not permit his amendment to go over and let us take up something else at this time. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is interested in that amendment and is not feeling well this afternoon.

Mr. COPELAND. With pleasure. I am very glad to withhold my amendment until a later time.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. I have no disposition to offer it at this time if it will interfere with his program or plan, but I have an amendment which I shall offer at an agreeable stage of the proceedings proposing to strike out that part of the bill providing for an advisory council.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOSES. In what status is the amendment of the Senator from New York now left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will remain on the table subject to call whenever the Senator from New York desires to call it up. The bill is now as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no particular objection to the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska. Of course, I do not want to do anything that will cause any inconvenience or discomfort to the Senator from Washington who I understand is ill. However, it is my desire that we shall press forward with the amendment offered by the Senator from New York because that would dispose of the largest problem yet to be solved in connection with the final disposition of the bill. If we could dispose of the proposition made by the Senator from New York in reference to fruit and vegetables, then to-morrow we could finally dispose of the matter by taking up the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. DILL. Will not the amendment of my colleague have some effect upon the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from New York?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not desire to yield to anyone at this time. I wanted to say that I have understood the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] was interested in the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] and had proposed an amendment to it. I may be wrong about it. I have no objection to the procedure outlined by the chairman of

the committee and only suggested a change in it because, as we all know, the Senator from Washington is ill at the present time and unable to proceed with any amendment that he has to offer. I assumed that he was interested in the amendment of the Senator from New York. Whether he is or not, I have no objection to going ahead as suggested by the chairman of the committee. I only offered the suggestion because I wanted to proceed and transact some business; that is all.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know what is in the mind of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I want to suggest that the parliamentary procedure might be that he would offer his amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. That then would involve both propositions. I think it is contemplated that a vote would be taken on the amendment of the Senator from Washington rather than upon the other amendment.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The amendment of my colleague relates to fruit, leaving vegetables in the bill, and is really an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If we attempt to dispose of the Copeland amendment, then we must properly consider the amendment of my colleague which, if adopted, would leave vegetables in the bill. I do not think there would be any objection to a discussion of the amendment; but if we are going to vote on it, it ought to go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). Let the Senate be in order, so that the proceedings may be heard. The Senator from Oregon has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. McNARY. Before I yield I want to make just a brief statement. In view of the illness of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the probability of his desire to participate in the debate, I shall not ask that we proceed to the consideration and discussion of his amendment this afternoon. The reason why I called up the subject first was merely a matter of procedure and a matter of dispatch in considering further amendments to the bill. I had said to a number of Senators that probably the next amendment to be considered would be the one now offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. In view of the discussion just had and the fact that we are not prepared to follow that line of procedure with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, I will now yield to the Senator from New York and then I will yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I suggest that the matter be placed before the Senate with a brief statement and, perhaps, the Senator from Washington might be able to remain through that statement. Then if it leads to debate, as I assume it will, because of the number of telegrams received relating to it, we can put off the vote until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York again submit his amendment?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I would much prefer that action on the amendment of the Senator from New York be deferred, if he is going to press it, until the conclusion of the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish to carry out the plan of the chairman of the committee and therefore shall not press my amendment to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York is returned to the table.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the truck growers of my State relative to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEGETTS, S. C., May 8, 1929.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,

Senator from South Carolina:

We strongly urge that you use your influence to defeat Senator McNARY's amendment to farm relief bill prohibiting growers of fruits and vegetables from coming within the scope of the bill. We should not be discriminated against.

SOUTH CAROLINA PRODUCE ASSOCIATION.



## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 35 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

## RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, May 9, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of May 7), 1929*

## SOLICITOR GENERAL

Charles Evans Hughes, jr., of New York, to be Solicitor General, vice William DeWitt Mitchell, appointed Attorney General.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Commander William Baggaley to be a captain in the Navy from the 21st day of January, 1929.

Lieut. Commander Mervyn S. Bennion to be a commander in the Navy from the 5th day of March, 1929.

Lieut. Commander Walter E. Brown to be a commander in the Navy from the 26th day of March, 1929.

Lieut. Volney O. Clark to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 5th day of March, 1929.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ehrwald F. Beck to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 15th day of July, 1928.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John J. O'Donnell, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1929.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Orson R. Sutherland to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1929.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edgar A. Cruise to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of March, 1929.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George D. Cooper to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 5th day of March, 1929.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1928:

Clarence C. Ray.

John J. Hourihan.

John W. Steele.

The following-named chief boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, on the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Harry W. Weinberg, September 13, 1925.

John T. Sunderman, May 15, 1925.

Thomas O. Kirby, December 15, 1923.

Svend J. Skou, December 15, 1923.

Frank H. Lemon, January 15, 1924.

Ivan E. Pitman, January 31, 1924.

Vern W. McGrew, January 31, 1924.

John O. Strickland, February 15, 1924.

William S. Burns, February 15, 1924.

William H. Fiddler, jr., April 15, 1924.

James F. Jeter, June 15, 1924.

James L. Freese, June 15, 1924.

Edgar J. Hayden, June 15, 1924.

Lyle Turner, July 15, 1924.

Anthony Feher, August 1, 1924.

Albert A. Webb, December 1, 1924.

Marshall McN. Angleton, December 15, 1924.

Milo Hazard, May 15, 1924.

David L. Ullman, October 7, 1924.

Kenneth C. Ingraham, December 19, 1926.

Fred Michaelis, June 14, 1926.

Henry M. Brun, May 4, 1927.

Thomas F. McDermott, July 20, 1926.

George P. Childs, December 26, 1926.

Harold E. Russell, August 10, 1924.

Harold L. Arnold, December 15, 1924.

William A. Buckley, March 26, 1928.

The following-named chief gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, on the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Warren C. Carr, December 15, 1923.

Charles A. Strumsky, February 15, 1924.

Arthur S. Fenton, September 1, 1924.

Joseph J. Cox, August 22, 1926.

Charles B. Day, May 12, 1926.

Francis Quotidomine, October 23, 1926.

William M. Coles, August 13, 1927.

Ralph T. Bundy, May 25, 1924.

The following-named chief electricians to be chief electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, on the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Merion E. Hair, September 1, 1924.

Aibert J. Petrusek, April 26, 1925.

Thomas Q. Costello, August 26, 1926.

The following-named chief radio electricians to be chief radio electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, on the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

William H. Frost, September 27, 1925.

George W. Almour, January 16, 1927.

The following-named chief machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, on the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Jacob F. Matsch, April 21, 1925.

Robert Farris, July 21, 1924.

John M. Fitzsimmons, December 3, 1924.

Ralph M. Jeffries, December 15, 1923.

John R. Rayhart, December 15, 1923.

John W. Cunningham, January 1, 1924.

William J. Lowe, January 31, 1924.

Edward J. Sherry, January 31, 1924.

William T. Crone, January 31, 1924.

Clarence C. McDow, February 15, 1924.

Meares B. Cartmell, June 15, 1924.

Edward J. Tyrrell, November 1, 1924.

Virgil D. Duke, November 1, 1924.

David L. Jones, February 15, 1925.

Thomas G. Powers, April 1, 1925.

Frederick W. Sievert, October 1, 1925.

Raymond G. Shively, January 16, 1926.

Vincent H. Starkweather, November 20, 1924.

Walter H. Wilson, August 26, 1924.

Harry F. Meachen, August 9, 1924.

Clarence J. P. Buckey, January 17, 1928.

Irvin J. Heckman, January 19, 1927.

The following-named chief carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, on the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

David Somers, August 18, 1926.

William J. Kennedy, August 21, 1926.

The following-named chief pay clerks to be chief pay clerks in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, on the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Harry S. MacKan, November 24, 1922.

Thomas S. Lowry, October 1, 1924.

Archie J. McDaniel, September 24, 1923.

Chauncey J. Buckley, July 2, 1923.

James A. Harris, July 2, 1923.

Crawford T. Folsom, September 24, 1923.

Albert H. Richter, July 20, 1924.

Norris D. Whitehill, November 15, 1923.

William D. Wilkinson, September 20, 1924.

Roderick C. Outten, May 6, 1923.

William L. A. Strawbridge, May 10, 1924.

Floyd L. Chapman, July 23, 1924.

Raymond V. Christmas, September 14, 1924.

Stanley A. Mann, August 2, 1924.

Charles A. Young, September 24, 1923.

Stanley C. King, November 2, 1923.

Oscar H. Weyel, August 22, 1925.

William D. Burroughs, July 8, 1925.

Writner Hostetter, August 20, 1924.

Frank L. Bevier, October 21, 1924.

Bellinger Dunham, March 19, 1926.

Henry L. Greenough, September 24, 1923.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of May 7), 1929*

## COMMISSIONER, GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Charles C. Moore.

## ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

J. Henry Scattergood.

## APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Col. Harry Lorenzo Gilchrist to be Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, with the rank of major general.

## PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Benjamin Dutton, jr., to be captain.  
 Halford R. Greenlee to be captain.  
 Reed M. Fawell to be captain.  
 Henry T. Settle to be commander.  
 Augustine H. Gray to be commander.  
 Ward P. Davis to be lieutenant commander.  
 Edward H. Jones to be lieutenant commander.  
 Harold F. Pullen to be lieutenant.  
 Bradford Bartlett to be lieutenant.  
 Ellwood E. Burgess to be lieutenant.  
 Donald R. Eldridge to be lieutenant.  
 Earl V. Sherman to be lieutenant.  
 Edmonston E. Coil to be lieutenant.  
 Edward R. Gardner to be lieutenant.  
 John Connor to be lieutenant.  
 George F. Watson to be lieutenant.  
 Austin S. Keeth to be lieutenant.  
 Gus R. Berner, jr., to be lieutenant.  
 Waldo Tullsen to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 Henry T. Brian to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 Frederick P. Williams to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 Thomas J. Kimes to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 Ernest J. Davis to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 John H. Lewis to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 Lewis M. Markham, jr., to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 Winthrop E. Terry to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 John C. Hammock to be lieutenant (junior grade).  
 Robert M. Kennedy to be medical director.  
 Marson W. Mangold to be dental surgeon.  
 Murray W. Clark to be assistant paymaster.  
 Herbert C. Borne to be chief pay clerk.  
 Claude W. Hamilton to be chief pay clerk.  
 Thomas W. Shea to be chief pay clerk.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, May 9, 1929

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 7, 1929)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Smoot
Barkley	Gillett	McMaster	Steak
Bingham	Glass	McNary	Stelwer
Black	Glenn	Metcalf	Stephens
Blaine	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Blease	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Greene	Nye	Townsend
Broussard	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Burton	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Patterson	Tyson
Caraway	Hastings	Phipps	Vandenberg
Connally	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Couzens	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Hebert	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Deneen	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Dill	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Edge	Kean	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	
Fletcher	King	Shortridge	

Mr. DILL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JONES] is absent by reason of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial of sundry citizens of Braintree and Randolph, Vt., remonstrating against the adoption of any calendar change affecting the continuity of the weekly cycle, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Pacific Coast Shoe Travelers' Association, favoring a reduction of 50 per cent in the Federal tax on earned incomes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the board of trustees Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, opposing the imposition of tariff duties upon manufactured lumber products or logs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Federal Bar Association, favoring the granting of increased

annuities to retired civil-service employees and also a reasonable pay increase to Federal employees by the device of restoring a salary step in the civil-service grades, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by sundry citizens of Chicago, Cook County, and the State of Illinois, who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War, favoring the prompt making of appropriations to provide ample hospital facilities, medical care, and treatment for incapacitated ex-service men and women, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted at a mass meeting (comprising approximately 3,000 people and representing about 100 different societies with a membership of 200,000) at Orchestra Hall, Chicago, Ill., favoring the repeal of the national-origins clause of the existing immigration law and a return to the previous immigration policy based on the census of 1890, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to enact legislation continuing the Federal appropriations for maternity and infancy welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. (See joint memorial printed in full when presented May 6, 1929, by Mr. LA FOLLETTE, page 869, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

He also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

House Joint Memorial 6 (by Mr. McDonald)

LEGISLATURE OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA,  
NINTH SESSION.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents—

That the construction and existence of a highway for automobile travel between Seattle, Wash., and Fairbanks, Alaska, passing through British Columbia and Yukon territory, would be of great benefit to both the United States and Canada, and your memorialist prays that appropriate steps be taken by the Government of the United States looking to the appointment of a commission or other representatives by the Canadian Government to confer with the Board of Road Commissioners for Alaska (War Department) on the subject of the said proposed international road and plans for its construction.

That Alaska, with an area of approximately one-fifth that of the continental United States, awaits further development. The means of transportation in the Territory are still inadequate, although its coasts are visited by ocean-going ships, its interior is penetrated for a distance by railroads, and its rivers in their circuitous courses afford access to an additional portion of its vast domain.

Stretching from Alaska's eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the United States are the Yukon territory and British Columbia, also largely undeveloped for a major portion of their enormous extent. The overland distance from Fairbanks, the geographic center of Alaska, to Seattle via the Yukon territory and British Columbia, is approximately 1,800 miles. Along this distance 900 miles of automobile roads have been constructed, and there are 200 miles of wagon road which can easily be brought up to the standard of an automobile highway. The distance of 700 miles remaining presents no serious construction difficulties; it is estimated that a gravel-surfaced road 16 feet wide can be built for \$7,000,000. A highway for automobile travel extending from Seattle to Fairbanks through the great frontiers of Canada and the United States will furnish both these countries with additional means for exploring their great undeveloped mineral wealth; it will provide an opportunity for hundreds of thousands to satisfy their ambition for auto travel through one of nature's most scenic wonderlands; it will bring prosperity to British Columbia, the Yukon territory, and Alaska, and at the same time will bring rich returns to both Canada and the United States for their investment; it will be the line of travel over which, by airplane, a new and valuable commerce with Asia may be established and maintained.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

Passed by the house of representatives April 12, 1929.

R. C. ROTHENBURG,  
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

ROBERT C. HURLEY,  
Clerk of the House.

Passed by the senate April 17, 1929.

WILL A. STEEL,  
President of the Senate.

Attest:

CASH COLE,  
Secretary of the Senate.